

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 494. A bill to reorganize the system of parole of prisoners convicted in the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 497. A bill to transfer the probation system for the District of Columbia to the probation system for United States courts; with an amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3515. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to corruptly influence participants or officials in contests of skill, speed, strength, or endurance, and to provide a penalty therefor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 135. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 3593. A bill to provide revenue from the short sales of shares of stock, grains, cotton, or other allied agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3594. A bill to prohibit communication of false information with respect to securities in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3595. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3596. A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," to clarify the eligibility for benefits of certain employees detained by the enemy in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3597. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3598. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Pacific coast and creating the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3599. A bill to provide medical care for war widows and medical and dental care for war orphans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3600. A bill to reimburse certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3601. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3602. A bill to exempt from admissions tax general admissions to agricultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3603. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the eightieth anniversary of the purchase of Alaska; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide, for purposes of taxation of income, that damage caused by the tidal wave which hit the Hawaiian Islands on April 1, 1946, and the subsequent tidal waves or like marine disturbances may be deducted from income in installments over a period of 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 3604. A bill to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3605. A bill for the relief of Richard W. Seagraves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3606. A bill for the relief of W. A. Chisholm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3607. A bill for the relief of W. A. Chisholm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3608. A bill for the relief of Cristeta La-Madrid Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 3609. A bill for the relief of Herluf F. J. Ravn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3610. A bill for the relief of Herluf F. J. Ravn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

565. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by William A. Bancroft Camp, No. 16, of United Spanish War Veterans, Racine, Wis., endorsing H. R. 969, which would increase pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

566. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Russell E. Pierce and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favorable consideration of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

567. Also, petition of St. Thomas Council, No. 1347, Knights of Columbus, Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for investigation and curtailment of alleged subversive activities of foreign agents working directly or indirectly within or without the continental United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 26, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in Heaven, for this sacred moment when our hearts may be united in prayer, and when, forgetting all else save our need of Thy guidance and help, we may reach up to Thee as Thou art reaching down to us.

Let not the beauty of this day, or the glow of good health, or the present prosperity of our undertakings deceive us into a false reliance upon our own strength. Thou hast given us every good thing. Thou hast given us life itself with whatever talents we possess and the time and the opportunity to use them. May we use them wisely, lest they be curtailed or taken away.

Deliver us from the error of asking and expecting Thy blessing and Thy guidance in our public lives while closing the doors to Thee in our private living. Thou knowest what we are wherever we are. Help us to be the best we can be.

We ask in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 23, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2094) for the relief of Isaac B. Jones, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to indicate that the Senate is moving today under the following unanimous-consent agreement:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, May 26, 1947, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to postpone to June 10, 1947, the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments.

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day of May 26 and the hour of 4 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the motion, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Under the circumstances, the Chair is unable to recognize any Senator except by permission of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] or the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

THE LATE JOSEPH MEDILL PATTERSON

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair inquires whether the Senator from Georgia wishes to yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from New York to present a matter briefly, the time to be charged to the proponents of the motion.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have just returned from attending a memorial mass for the late Joseph Medill Patterson. The memory of the life and works of this extraordinary man will long endure.

Born and bred to aristocracy, he made his life's crusade the understanding and the fulfillment of the common man's aspirations.

As soldier and citizen, as public official and newspaper publisher, he contributed far more than his share to the progress, security, and happiness of his fellow man.

I rise on this anniversary of his death to pay this brief tribute to his memory, and to place in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a more extended testimonial which I delivered on another occasion, September 9 last. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, we have met here today in response to a single impulse: To draw inspiration once more from the memory of a great and valiant man whom we learned to love. Our purpose is to erect a perpetual testimonial of our admiration and affection for Capt. Joseph Medill Patterson.

You and I, who knew and worked with Captain Patterson, have no need for speeches to explain our presence here. Each of us could commune with himself and from his own association with this man of vigor and vision, readily call to mind the qualities which evoke our fond recollection and command our loyalty and homage. But we are not content with such silent communion. We want the whole community to hear our reflections, to learn and to know that a great-hearted giant had lived in our midst. We desire to communicate to future generations our response to his greatness, his simplicity, and his humanity.

Let us, therefore, record the noteworthy fact that we, who are here assembled, are the members of the Daily News chapel of the Typographical Union No. 6. We are members of a labor union which chooses to commemorate in honor and affection the man who was our boss. This novel and arresting fact alone, this departure from the usual pattern, vividly demonstrates that Captain Patterson was an unusual man. The stereotyped cartoon of a publisher as a fat man, chewing a fat cigar, his vest besprinkled with dollar signs, was not conceived with Mr. Patterson as the model.

He was an extraordinary man, and he exhibited the rare man's paradoxes. He was born and bred to aristocracy, but none despised more vehemently the trappings of caste and class. He was accustomed to great wealth, but few had keener understanding of the problems of poverty. He had access to the high and mighty of the land; he preferred to know the aims, ambitions, and strivings of the little people. By natural aptitude he was a fighter and a man of action, but he selected the printed word as his sword and tool.

Already, even in his lifetime, his name was embroidered with legendary exploits. There is the story that he used to come to his editorial desk at the Chicago Tribune dressed in corduroys and a turtle-neck sweater. You have heard reports of his excursions among the derelicts, sampling their lonely and bitter existence. Numerous tales have circulated about his uncanny perception of the trend of public taste and mood. There are two stories that I like best, because they hold up a clear mirror to the man himself.

The first is the story of an argument between Patterson and one of his executives, which concluded with these words of the publisher: "The fact that I decide against you is no proof that I'm right and you're wrong. It may be that I'm wrong and you're right. It's purely because of an accident of birth that I happen to be in a position where I get my way." Few men of wealth and power see themselves with such candor and clarity.

The second incident I cherish as the symbol of his simplicity. It is the text of what he wrote when his circulation manager passed away: "Memo to Max Annenberg," he wrote. "Good-by, I am going to miss you a lot. Hope to be seeing you someday." There were no flourishes, but all who read that unadorned memo know that here was a man mourning the loss of his friend.

He was a playwright whose plays appeared on Broadway. He was a soldier so conspicuous that General MacArthur spoke of him as "the greatest natural-born soldier that ever served under my command." It was not in his make-up to seek an easy assignment or a safe berth. In five of the most violent engagements in World War I he demonstrated the stuff he was made of. Before World War I he had already served a term in the Illinois Legislature and in the office of Commissioner of Public Works of the City of Chicago. Already he was giving conspicuous evidence of those qualities which ultimately produced his greatest enterprise, the New York Daily News. Each day during the past 28 years that paper has reflected his singular independence of mind, the vividness of his imagination, his genuine understanding of the great masses of his fellow citizens. That understanding never failed him because it was founded upon a true sympathy with the common people. With Patterson it was not a rhetorical flourish but the expression of his very being when he carved upon the face of this building the closing phrase of Lincoln's immortal saying, "God must have loved the common people; he made so many of them."

When I consider the magnitude of his achievement in building this great institution, the News, I put in second place the fact that it is a stupendous business undertaking, outstripping all its competitors in a contest in which all the odds were against him, provid-

ing a livelihood for thousands of families, and great wealth for its stockholders and managers. What I put in first place is that he succeeded in building a pipe line for the transmission of news, opinion, and intelligence into 4,000,000 homes—the largest channel of its kind in the United States. He was its inventive genius, its architect, its designer. It is today a photographic image of his versatile personality. You, my friends, helped to maintain it, to sustain its pressure, and to carry its life-giving cargo to a vast population.

In many a cause in which I was privileged to carry the banner, he was a potent, resourceful, and trusted ally. There were times when we disagreed and then he was an equally potent, resourceful, and always chivalrous opponent. Even in the grimmest disagreements, no one could ever question the integrity of his motives, the purity of his patriotism, or his complete devotion to our country.

Men capable of wielding great power frequently become obsessed with a sense of their own wisdom and lose respect for the view of others. That sorry trait Mr. Patterson never exhibited. No one whose character is marred by such a flaw could have invented the idea of the annual Battle Page, where both sides in the campaign could equally and freely express their views regardless of the position taken on the editorial page. And there is not a newspaperman on the staff of the News who has not felt perfectly free to espouse any public cause without fear of reprisal.

Men who can command the fulfillment of their every wish sometimes become thoughtless of the fate and fortune of their struggling brethren. Not so Mr. Patterson. He said to me once, "I have to go slow. I have to consider so many people—the people who work with me. If I make a business mistake I am likely to penalize them without intending to do so. If I should wreck this business, thousands of people I have never seen would suffer; their children might go hungry. The responsibility frightens me sometimes. That's why I have to go slow."

And that is why we have come to lay a wreath of our tribute, our esteem and affection at his feet. That is why, I am sure, in the Great Beyond he is happy to witness these ceremonies, happy to win that which no one has ever amassed enough wealth to be able to buy—a little silver plaque bearing the evidence of the love of his coworkers. The price of that is a great human heart.

Captain Patterson, we salute you. Well have you earned the rest that Kipling spoke of:

"When Earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and faith, we shall need it—
Lie down for an eon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall set us to work anew!

"And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of the working, and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the Thing as he sees it, for the God of Things as They Are!"

RESPONSE OF WAR DEPARTMENT TO HANSON BALDWIN'S EIGHT OBJECTIONS TO UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a few moments?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on May 4 Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times, published an article in that newspaper in which he raised eight objections to universal military training on the broad ground that it does not meet the challenge of modern war. Mr. Baldwin's standing is so high and the subject is so important that I deemed it advisable to refer his article to the Secretary of War, requesting him to comment in detail on Mr. Baldwin's eight points.

I have just now received a letter from Hon. Robert P. Patterson, the Secretary of War, in which he encloses a statement which responds to Mr. Baldwin's objections. But it is much more than a rebuttal to what Mr. Baldwin says. I regard it as one of the clearest, most illuminating, most comprehensive, and most authoritative statements on American strategy as a whole which I have seen published since I came to the Senate in January of this year.

Because of the vital importance of this subject to every Senator, I believe that Mr. Baldwin's article and the War Department's rebuttal thereto, together with Mr. Patterson's letter to me, should be printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the article, together with the letter from the Secretary of War and the War Department's rebuttal, be printed in the body of the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Armed Services for their attention.

There being no objection, the matters presented by Mr. LODGE were received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**UMT'S VALUE WEIGHED—EIGHT REASONS WHY
UNIVERSAL TRAINING IS OF DOUBTFUL MILITARY WORTH**

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Peacetime universal military training, soon to be submitted to Congress, stands or falls on its military utility.

Its fair-minded opponents concede that despite its repugnance to the American tradition, UMT must be supported if it is proved essential to United States security. But the burden of proof, they rightly add, rests upon the military.

The War Department holds, and its official view is probably supported by a majority of Army officers, that UMT is a vital part, in fact, a cornerstone, of our national defense program.

Some few officers and outside critics are, however, emphatic in their opposition; they charge the War Department with deception in insisting that UMT is essential to national security and flatly deny this assertion.

ON CONTROL OF AIR, SEA

There are extremists on both sides of the argument, but any consideration of all the factors makes it plain that UMT is a very dubious form of security, if, indeed, it offers any security at all, in this technological and industrial age. Here are some of the factors that tend to minimize its military value:

1. Attack can come to the United States, and we can attack any enemy, only through the air or by sea. In the initial phases of any war of any nature using any weapons what is of primary and fundamental importance is, therefore, control of the air and the sea. Emphasis, therefore, should be on insular strategy as opposed to continental strategy, on air-sea strategy as opposed to mass army strategy.

2. The problem of United States defense breaks down into time periods, the short

term and the long term. In the immediate future when the only component of push-button war that we have is the push button—perhaps for 10 years, perhaps longer—the weapons and techniques that won the last war will still have validity. It is in this period, before transoceanic guided missiles with atomic warheads have been developed, that large ground armies, to follow up and complete offensives launched by sea and sky, will continue to have a very considerable degree of usefulness. But during this period the United States has a reserve of trained manpower (declining in skill and usefulness as the end of the period is reached) already trained far more thoroughly by one, two, four, or more years in the wartime services, than any 6 months' trainee could be.

In the long-term future, when transoceanic missile war may become possible, initial victory or defeat would not in any case depend upon a mass of semitrained reserves for the ground army. If the war ended quickly it would be won or lost by our superiority or inferiority in missiles, air power, the atomic bomb, and other new weapons of destruction, and a large ground army could not greatly influence the course of the brief conflict.

TIME FACTOR CONSIDERED

If the war continued without decision, virtually complete control of the air and the sea would be necessary in any case before we could transport large armies overseas by sea or air and time would be required to equip those armies. There would thus be time for training; in fact, training for the ground battlefield is one of the lesser problems of any future war. This is not to say that ground troops will not be necessary; in any future war clearly they will—certainly for occupation after conquest, very probably to help to win the victory. But they cannot possibly influence (except by the firing of projectiles) the initial and supremely vital phases of any push-button war, and if a push-button war develops into a war of attrition there will be ample time to train large ground forces, and to train them under wartime incentive far better and with the benefit of higher morale than is possible under a 6-month peacetime system.

3. Today, and even more tomorrow, the offense has such an edge on the defense that the greatest hope of victory, or of avoiding atomic attack, is the threat of tremendous and overwhelming retaliation.

In other words, we cannot build any Maginot Line that will protect the United States against all forms of attack, but we can create a mobile, instantly ready striking force, planes, guided missiles, aircraft carriers or fast surface missile launchers, submarines, and small but highly trained forces of airborne troops, which can strike at once against any enemy that attacks us.

This force will need manpower, but it must be full-time, highly trained manpower, not half-baked, half-trained reserves. This force will need large numbers of men to launch missiles (it takes several hundred to prepare a single German V-2 rocket for launching), but UMT will not provide the type of training needed.

4. There is need in any future missile war for large forces to provide military or semi-military disaster control and civilian defense duties on the home front. This should be the mission of the National Guard or some similar force, and it should be specifically trained to that end, but the UMT training program is not pointed toward any such end.

5. A good military case might have been made for extension of the wartime draft act until our occupation duties overseas had ended, but UMT—limited to training in this country—will not provide a single man for overseas service, and, in fact, will add to the Army's manpower problem by requiring an

added 130,000 to 150,000 men for training overhead and cadre.

FLOW TO GUARD, RESERVES

6. UMT will provide a flow of manpower for the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, but these civilian components, or part-time soldiers, cannot possibly be ready for instant action in an emergency, and yet instantly ready forces are the type required in the atomic age.

7. The cost of UMT—direct and indirect—is likely to be so large as to starve—particularly in this essential era of economy in government—more important aspects of national defense—the diplomatic service; the regular services, which must be instantly ready; intelligence, research, and development; the services' school system; industrial mobilization; etc.

8. UMT by its very size and cost may build up the shadow of security without its substance; there is grave danger we may create in our military psychology a Maginot Line concept. Air power, missiles, new weapons, sea power must have priority.

In this atomic age, the military emphasis—if there is to be any degree of security—must be on regular forces, highly trained, instantly ready; not on some mass army that may be ready many months after M-day. As Maj. Gen. John S. Wood, wartime commander of the famous Fourth Armored Division, has put it, UMT will not produce a single unit ready to fight or a single fighting man for immediate use.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 23, 1947.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: In reply to your letter of May 6, 1947, requesting an answer to the eight objections to universal military training raised by Mr. Hanson Baldwin in his article in the New York Times of May 4, 1947, I am attaching a statement which answers Mr. Baldwin point by point.

I am glad to submit this answer to you for your own information and, as you suggest in your letter, for introduction into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it will be available to other Members of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

**UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING MUST STAND ON
MILITARY NECESSITY**

Universal military training is a military program. Its primary purpose is to build up a reservoir of trained manpower for a military emergency. Its byproducts of great moral and social benefits are very important for a democracy such as ours, but its principal product, trained manpower, must be the real reason for its establishment.

In the New York Times of May 4, 1947, Hanson Baldwin accepts the basic test of the potential usefulness of universal military training but proceeds to give eight factors that, in his opinion, minimize its value.

Mr. Baldwin first states that universal military training is based on "continental" strategy instead of "insular" strategy.

The terms "insular" and "continental" are not defined by Mr. Baldwin, but the implication appears to be that the War Department strategy is based on the use of a large mass army. It might be well, therefore, to analyze the American strategy of war for an atomic age.

In planning strategy for the future, America must face tomorrow as well as next month, next year or two, the next decade, and the next score of years. For tomorrow, or for next year, "push button" warfare is but a promise. No possible enemies have now, or in the near future will have, any guided missiles with which to attack us from the

Eurasian land mass. Meanwhile, we must be prepared for the immediate future—not with so-called mass armies but with balanced armed forces. These forces will be composed of naval forces, large air forces, complex logistical forces, and highly mobile combat divisions of air-transportable troops, to seize bases close enough to the enemy to permit the rapid employment of our maximum power against the enemy's home country. This will take trained manpower, but all of this manpower must have the benefit of basic military training. The war will be shortened in proportion to the time it takes to seize and hold key bases. This will depend largely on the time it takes us to mobilize and train our men. For every day of training we undertake in peacetime we may save weeks and months of war.

In order to control the sea or air we must, of course, first of all hold the fortress of America and essential air and sea bases. However, to seize and hold such key bases, from which otherwise an enemy might launch air missiles against the United States, will require combined land, sea, and air operations on a large scale. In other words, a sound strategic defense will require the early assumption of the tactical offensive. We visualize that the first of such operations will be conducted largely by air forces and air-and-sea-transported land forces. Such forces require the deployment of great numbers of men, on the ground, at air and sea bases, launching sites, ports, depots, communication lines, and elsewhere. It is not conceivable that personnel employed in these activities could be fully effective in the numbers and at the time required, without previous basic military training. Certainly, the numbers involved will be far larger than we will be willing or able to maintain in a standing peacetime establishment.

We must distinguish between massed battle formations and large armies. Massed infantry formations on the battlefield have declined since Napoleonic wars and we may expect this tendency to continue. America, since colonial and Indian days, has led the world away from mass formations and toward wide deployment and open warfare. Atomic and other scientific developments will, without question, further accelerate this trend. We had no mass army in World War II. We had only 89 divisions scattered over the whole world. Even within these divisions, the proportion of technical and logistical troops to riflemen was high. The over-all proportion of air and service troops to ground combat troops was, of course, much higher. This proportion can be expected to grow. However, there is no historical or scientific evidence that armies are becoming smaller because of this trend. On the contrary, all the evidence proves that, as weapons and means become more powerful, armed forces have necessarily become much larger. Logistical requirements to support the more powerful weapons and the necessity for wide deployment make more men necessary in the battle and communications zones, even though there are fewer infantrymen on the firing line.

No one can foretell when the methods, weapons, and techniques of the present will finally be replaced. Revision and improvement is a continuing process. Our best advice is that push-button warfare is many years away.

We must do everything we can now to prevent a long war—if war comes. UMT offers a sure saving in time. No reasonable and practical alternative has been suggested.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS MUST BE RELIEVED BY TRAINED REPLACEMENTS

Mr. Baldwin's second proposition is that we already have trained and battle-tested troops to meet an immediate emergency. Even with universal training, it will be more than 5 years before a substantial new reserve would be trained. During those 5 years,

the reserve of trained veterans, upon which Mr. Baldwin is willing to rely, will be depleted at the rate of over a million a year, by reason of the fact that these men are acquiring dependents, and are taking on weight and infirmities with their added years. If we do not start now to replace this trained manpower it will be almost wholly dissipated in about 5 years. UMT cannot safely be delayed.

UMT WILL SHORTEN A FUTURE WAR

Mr. Baldwin, in the discussion of his second point, arrives at the conclusion that because men would not be completely trained the whole program should be abandoned. It has never been contended that UMT would turn out a finished product. The increased velocity and power of weapons and means for waging war available to our enemies make the task of total preparation far greater than can reasonably be accomplished after the advent of war. If we are to reach maximum effectiveness in time for the decisive phase, many time-consuming steps must have been taken well in advance. Obviously the whole job cannot be done in advance without staggering cost. We must search for an optimum balance between ideal requirements and practical capabilities.

UMT WILL ALLOW DECISIVE OFFENSIVE TO BE ASSUMED MUCH EARLIER

Mr. Baldwin's third proposition emphasizes the fact that the offensive has many advantages over the defensive. However, as applied to the United States, this maxim may very well run against us—not for us—in the initial stages of a future war. We have no aggressive intent anywhere in the world. We may be confronted with a long-planned surprise offensive. Therefore, we are almost certain to pass through an initial defensive phase which we should contrive to shorten as far as possible. UMT is the best means of shortening this phase. It is the best insurance that our scientific air-sea-land effort can quickly reach its maximum power.

It is certainly not clear how Mr. Baldwin could interpret a trained civilian manpower as a Maginot Line, when the whole philosophy of UMT is to speed up the time it takes to shift to the aggressive decisive counterattack. It is pertinent that only last March Prof. Albert Einstein, who is intimately familiar with the capabilities of atomic energy, specifically and publicly warned us that we may be treating the atom bomb (and by implication other scientific means), as a Maginot Line. He stated that the bomb secret gives us "security only in imagination." * * * and to that extent is a great danger."

We agree with Mr. Baldwin that reserves, no matter how well trained, cannot possibly eliminate the need for a highly skilled Regular force. But the existence of trained reserves will make whatever standing force we are allowed to retain much more readily available for immediate action. Our Regular forces will always be largely committed abroad in insular possessions. We will never have enough men, in Regular Army units alone, to undertake all the initial tasks of total mobilization. They must be supported immediately by the National Guard, ORC, and other civilian components which must, in turn, be backed up by UMT to provide the requisite manpower and training. Lacking this support they will be depleted at the outset to do jobs which trained reserves could otherwise do. And when committed to action they will be subject to suicidal sacrifices if they have no early support.

UMT ESSENTIAL TO CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. Baldwin's fourth proposition is that UMT does not point to civil defense, now becoming extremely vital in case of war. This is exactly contrary to the fundamental basis of the whole UMT plan as envisaged by the War Department. Training in first aid, basic hygiene, sanitation, organization, discipline,

the use of small arms and sentry duty are all included in universal military training. These subjects are of the essence of civil defense training. True, UMT itself creates no organization for civil defense, but it is an essential first step, for it provides a trained nucleus of able-bodied men in every community.

CONSCRIPTION NOT A PRACTICAL PEACETIME ALTERNATIVE

Item number five states that a good case could have been made for the extension of the wartime draft and that UMT provides no men for overseas. That is certainly true. But the certainty of lack of public and congressional support for an extension of the World War II Selective Service Act ruled that out as a practical peacetime alternative to UMT. A fair trial of the voluntary method of maintaining the regular forces is essential. The volunteer system is far superior if it produces sufficient troops. If it fails, the public and the Congress will then have to face the question of some form of peacetime selective service as a remedy, as was stated in my recommendation to the President last spring not to seek extension of selective service then. But this remedy is directed to the question of maintaining our standing forces and not of training our civilian reserve. UMT is the only practical solution to that problem.

REGULAR ARMY SHOULD BE MUCH LARGER WITHOUT UMT

A much larger Army will be required without UMT than will be required with UMT to attain the same degree of security. Universal military training increases the peacetime responsibilities of the Regular Army but does not increase its burdens as Mr. Hanson Baldwin indicates. On the contrary, it lightens the burden. At the opening of hostilities, days and months have been lost while training cadres were set up and fundamentals inculcated in new soldiers. With universal military training, there will be called into service thousands of men who will not have to begin from scratch.

The Regular Army has responsibilities for the training of the National Guard and Reserves. Trained manpower will facilitate efficient performance.

The Regular Army's main job today is occupation. Universal military training will not solve the problem of manpower for our forces in Germany and Japan except insofar as it may stimulate interest in the Army as a career. The primary and traditional job of the Regular Army, however, is training, and universal military training will give the Army the men in peacetime, before hostilities begin, who will be invaluable if war comes and will save time, money, and lives.

To rely wholly on a Regular Army, especially of the size needed in a war of today or tomorrow, would be far more expensive and moreover would be contrary to the American traditional attitude toward standing armies. The concept of universal preparedness for all able-bodied men, however, is as old as the English common law.

CIVILIAN COMPONENTS ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Point No. 6 in Mr. Baldwin's article states that the program is primarily designed to strengthen the National Guard and Reserve components, the value of which he impugns as not being immediately ready for combat service in this atomic age. Certainly, the program is pointed towards strengthening the National Guard and Organized Reserve (among other essential goals). UMT will make the National Guard more efficient in the future than ever before. There is now the richest reserve of trained and war-experienced National Guard and Reserve leadership in history to train and lead its new organizations. The National Guard and Reserve in World War II enriched their tradition in the service of the Nation. The National Guard and selected units of the Or-

ganized Reserve will be able in the future to meet certain vital, early, emergency missions better than ever in the past. The National Guard will be ready for decisive combat missions months earlier, with UMT, than ever before. It must be realized that all M-day missions are not necessarily combat missions on a battlefield. Many such missions require troops, which can still be in their training phase, for example, civil defense and to relieve Regular Army units of their zone of the interior, communications-zone and base-defense missions to make them immediately available to the mobile striking force for active combat. The proper performance of such vital support missions, in the very earliest stages of a future war, may turn a threat of early defeat into eventual victory. They cannot possibly be performed in time without well-trained reserve units. UMT will thus make a major and perhaps decisive contribution in the very first phase of a future war. Its value during the later build-up stage, in speeding up replacements and supports and in furnishing the life blood of the civil defense structure, will be equally great.

MILITARY BUDGET MUST BE BALANCED AMONG ALL ESSENTIALS

The seventh proposition is that the UMT program will be costly and will thus starve other activities, such as the State Department, intelligence, research and development, service schools, and industrial mobilization. All of these programs are as vitally essential as UMT and must be preserved. All elements of preparedness must be balanced within the funds that can reasonably be made available. Such funds as are made available for security, which includes sizable appropriations for other departments of the Government than War and Navy, must be apportioned among all essential preparedness programs without eliminating any one essential. UMT, in terms of eventual dividends, is one of the cheapest of all preparedness measures. The savings in months of war expenditures of billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives will be incalculable.

The eighth proposition states that UMT, by its very size, may build a shadow of strength and security without substance—that air and sea power and guided missiles and new weapons must have priority. Here Mr. Baldwin reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of UMT and of a proper balance of armed forces required to achieve victory should we be forced into a war now, or in the foreseeable future. UMT is not an end in itself. It is not another weapon or another armed force to be gaged in comparison with land, sea, and air power. It is the means of providing trained manpower to make the Navy and Air Force as well as the ground Army and the civil-defense structure quickly effective in the event of war. It is essential to a quick build-up of all of those forces. And in a future war speed will be of the essence of victory. Mr. Baldwin's whole article is based on a basic misapprehension of the importance of this fundamental fact. He treats UMT as essentially a negation of modern developments in air, sea, and land power. Whereas, actually, it is the very speed and complexity of modern warfare which makes UMT, for the first time, an absolute essential to our military security. The speed of war requires that men be made effective much quicker than ever before. The complexity requires that they receive more training than ever before. Further, UMT is the only substitute for the strong Allies who in our last two wars bore the brunt of the attack while we were building up our fighting forces.

NO PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVE TO UMT

Nowhere in his article does Mr. Baldwin face these simple facts—that a war of the future will require a more comprehensive and a more rapid mobilization than we have ever faced before, that this will require us to train more men in a shorter time than ever before

and that the only way we can shorten the time is to train them before the advent of war. This requires peacetime military training of civilians in large numbers. For the foreseeable future, every man in the armed forces, regardless of his branch or how technical his ultimate assignment, must have basic training of the type contemplated under UMT. That is universal military training by any name you choose to call it.

The value of the trained man as compared to the untrained man is as undeniable in the military field as in the field of medicine, law, science, or industry. This need of trained manpower, if the country is to have a strong defense establishment, was as manifest to Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson in former times as to Pershing, Marshall, and Eisenhower in our own times.

President Washington stated: "It may be laid down as a primary position, and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a portion of his property, but even of his personal services to the defense of it."

General Marshall stated: "I think you have to frankly face two things: Either universal military training or the hope—that is all you can possibly have—the hope that you will have better than a year for preparation. Of course, if you decide to repeat the policies of the past and rest your security on a hope, it means that your lack of readiness would, in my opinion, encourage the very thing you wish so earnestly to avoid, namely, the tragedy of another war."

Washington's statement of a fundamental requirement of our democratic system has now become an urgent necessity to the survival of that system. The drastic developments in the speed and destructive power of modern war make unavoidable the choice presented by General Marshall. We can be guided by the founder of our democracy and insure our system of a reasonable chance of survival; or we can be guided by wishful thinking, and stake the survival of our system on a reckless gamble.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REINCORPORATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

UTILIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH UNRRA LIQUIDATION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Liquidation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PARTICIPATION IN INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for participation by the United States in the Inter-American Conference on Social Security and its Permanent Committee and authorizing an appropriation therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS AND CONSOLIDATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS BY FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize intra-agency transfers and consolidations of appropriations by the Federal Security Administrator, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 17"

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, S. 866, of the Eightieth Congress, first session

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is faced with a housing crisis so far reaching in scope and so serious in nature that the Territory is unable to cope with it fully if unassisted by Federal aid; and

"Whereas until the enactment of further legislation by the Congress additional Federal funds will not be available to alleviate the discomfort and suffering of countless residents of the Territory who are now living in inadequate accommodations; and

"Whereas the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, S. 866 of the Eightieth Congress, first session, entitled 'A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof; to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes,' presents a well-considered program for housing which, if enacted, would be of aid to all the States as well as the Territory in assuring adequate housing both through privately financed construction and public low-rent projects; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the twenty-fourth session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to enact said Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Engineers' Club, of Minneapolis, Minn., expressing that club's appreciation and gratification for changing the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the American Veterans' Committee, Territory of Hawaii, Chapter No. 7, Lower Manoa, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 857) to remove the racial restrictions upon naturalization and to amend the immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of the members of the Pensacola Townsend Club, No. 1, and sundry citizens of Boynton Beach, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LUCAS:

A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, favoring location of an

atomic-energy laboratory on Government-owned land near Elwood, Ill.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on May 23, 1947, p. 5706, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

MISSOURI LEGISLATURE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION APPROVING PRINCIPLE OF WORLD FEDERATION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, adopted on May 13, 1947, by the Senate, and on May 15, 1947, by the House of Representatives of the Missouri Legislature, being a concurrent resolution approving the principle of world federation.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution approving the principle of world federation

Whereas it is necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free, the following principles and objectives are hereby enunciated in—

"THE DECLARATION OF THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD"

"Man, the source of all political authority, is a manifold political being. He is a citizen of several communities: the state, the nation, and the world. To each of these communities he owes inalienable obligations and from each he receives enduring benefits.

"Communities may exist for a time without being incorporated but, under the stress of adversity, they disintegrate unless legally organized. Slowly, but purposefully, through the centuries civilization has united the world, integrating its diverse local interests and creating an international community that now embraces every region and every person on the globe. This community has no government, and communities without government perish. Either this community must succumb to anarchy or submit to the restraints of law and order.

"Governments can only be established through the deliberate efforts of men. Man has struggled from time immemorial to endow the individual with certain fundamental rights whose very existence is now imperiled. Among those rights is man's freedom to worship, speak, write, assemble, and vote without arbitrary interference. To safeguard these liberties as a heritage for the human race, governments were instituted among men, with constitutional guarantees against the despotic exercise of political authority, such as are provided by elected parliaments, trial by jury, habeas corpus, and due process of law. Man must now either consolidate his historic rights or lose them for generations to come.

"The ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science, industry, and economics, as well as by the spiritual, social, and intellectual forces which impregnate all cultures, make political and geographical isolation of nations hereafter impossible. The organic life of the human race is at last indissolubly unified and can never be severed, but it must be politically ordained and made subject to law. Only a government capable of discharging all the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres can accomplish such a task. Civiliza-

tion now requires laws, in the place of treaties, as instruments to regulate commerce between peoples. The intricate conditions of modern life have rendered treaties ineffectual and obsolete, and made laws essential and inevitable. The age of treaties is dead; the age of laws is here.

"Governments, limited in their jurisdiction to local geographical areas, can no longer satisfy the needs or fulfill the obligations of the human race. Just as feudalism served its purpose in human history and was superseded by nationalism, so has nationalism reached its apogee in this generation and yielded its hegemony in the body politic to internationalism. The first duty of government is to protect life and property, and when governments cease to perform this function, they capitulate on the fundamental principle of their *raison d'être*. Nationalism, moreover, is no longer able to preserve the political independence or the territorial integrity of nations, as recent history so tragically confirms. Sovereignty is an ideological concept without geographical barriers. It is better for the world to be ruled by an international sovereignty of reason, social justice, and peace than by diverse national sovereignties organically incapable of preventing their own dissolution by conquest. Mankind must pool its resources of defense if civilization is to endure.

"History has revealed but one principle by which free peoples, inhabiting extensive territories, can unite under one government without impairing their local autonomy. That principle is federation, whose virtue preserves the whole without destroying its parts and strengthens its parts without jeopardizing the whole. Federation vitalizes all nations by endowing them with security and freedom to develop their respective cultures without menace of foreign domination. It regards as sacrosanct man's personality, his rights as an individual and as a citizen and his role as a partner with all other men in the common enterprise of building civilization for the benefit of mankind. It suppresses the crime of war by reducing to the ultimate minimum the possibility of its occurrence. It renders unnecessary the further paralyzing expenditure of wealth for belligerent activity, and cancels through the ages the mortgages of war against the fortunes and services of men. It releases the full energies, intelligence, and assets of society for creative, ameliorative, and redemptive work on behalf of humanity. It recognizes man's morning vision of his destiny as an authentic potentiality. It apprehends the entire human race as one, family, human beings everywhere as brothers and all nations as component parts of an indivisible community.

"There is no alternative to the federation of all nations except endless war. No substitute for the federation of the world can organize the international community on the basis of freedom and permanent peace. Even if continental, regional or ideological federations were attempted, the governments of these federations, in an effort to make impregnable their separate defenses, would be obliged to maintain stupendously competitive armies and navies, thereby condemning humanity indefinitely to exhaustive taxation, compulsory military service and ultimate carnage, which history reveals to be not only criminally futile but positively avoidable through judicious foresight in federating all nations. No nation should be excluded from membership in the federation of the world that is willing to limit its military, naval, and air forces, retaining only a constabulary sufficient to police its territory and to maintain order within its jurisdiction, provided that the eligible voters of that nation are permitted the free expression of their opinions at the polls.

"It being our profound and irrevocable conviction:

"That man should be forever free and that his historic rights as an individual and as a citizen should be protected by all the safeguards sanctioned by political wisdom and experience.

"That governments are essential to the existence of communities and that the absence of government is anarchy.

"That there exists an international community, encompassing the entire world, which has no government and which is destined, either to be ruthlessly dominated and exploited by totalitarianism or to be federated by democracy upon the principle of freedom for all nations and individuals.

"That all human beings are citizens of this world community, which requires laws and not treaties for its government.

"That world federation is the keystone in the arch of civilization, humanity's charter of liberty for all peoples, and the signet authenticating at last the union of the nations in freedom and peace.

"That there are supreme moments in history when nations are summoned, as trustees of civilization, to defend the heritage of the ages and to create institutions essential for human progress. In the providence of God, such a crisis is this hour, compelling in duty and unprecedented in responsibility—a fateful moment when men meet destiny for the fulfillment of historic tasks": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of Missouri does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a world federation, and requests the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Missouri to support and vote for a resolution in the Congress of the United States, approving the principle of world federation and requesting the President of the United States to initiate the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution for the federation of the world, which shall be submitted to each nation for its ratification.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Missouri.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

FARM BUREAU SOIL CONSERVATION AND FERTILIZER PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from H. A. Praeger, president, Kansas Farm Bureau, expressing approval of Senate bill 1251, known as the Farm Bureau soil conservation and fertilizer program. I ask unanimous consent to present the telegram and request that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOISINGTON, KANS., May 15, 1947.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for sponsoring S. 1251, the Farm Bureau soil conservation and fertilizer measure. Forty thousand Kansas farmers who are members of Kansas Farm Bureau are asking Congress to pass this bill. Appreciate your influence for an immediate hearing in the committee of this proposed legislation. Your cooperation in getting this bill through the Senate appreciated.

H. A. PRAEGER,
President, Kansas Farm Bureau.

UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LAW

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

body of the RECORD an editorial published recently by the Presbyterian magazine of Philadelphia, endorsing the Capper divorce bill now before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BILL TO SUPPORT

Hundreds of bills go into the hopper in the halls of Congress, but few emerge from the pigeonholes of committees. Senator CAPPER has introduced one which should interest all citizens who are troubled by the lax divorce laws of most of the States. His bill would establish, by constitutional amendment, a uniform Federal divorce law. It would prohibit divorce except on one of these six grounds: adultery, cruel and inhuman treatment, abandonment, or nonsupport for 1 year, habitual drunkenness, incurable insanity, conviction for an infamous crime. Although such a law would mean a relaxation in such States as New York, it would mean a great improvement in the conditions that now exist in quite a few States. It would wipe out overnight the scandalous divorce mills of such States as Florida and Nevada. Reno would sink again to its rightful level as a frontier town—or, rather, it would rise to that decent level. And although the Capper bill does not conform to the Biblical and Christian standard, it promises so much in approaching that ideal that it should receive the hearty support of all Christian citizens and churches. Fanatical supporters of State's rights should keep their hands off. Here is a moral issue that concerns the whole Nation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 1237. A bill to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 199).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 2353. A bill to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 202).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1318. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha district for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; with an amendment (Rept. No. 203).

By Mr. CORDON:

From the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2436. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 201).

From the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1185. A bill to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 204); and

S. 1262. A bill to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 205).

CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS— REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I ask

unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 1874) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 200) thereon. Similar bills were introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] and by the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1336. A bill for the relief of Abbot Low Moffat; and

S. 1337. A bill for the relief of Hou Chung Chay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1338. A bill to amend the Articles for the Government of the Navy to improve the administration of naval justice; and

S. 1339. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1340. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1341. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veteran Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1342. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward E. Pauls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1343. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Elliot Towne; and

S. 1344. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Ida Towne Barrett; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1345. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1346. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Burks L. Fieldier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1348. A bill to provide for the addition of certain revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1349. A bill for the relief of Kaoru (or Richard) Nimori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1350. A bill to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the month of June, 1947, as "Remember Disabled Veterans Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the first day of each year as "Good Neighbor Day," when American citizens will focus their attention upon setting an example of friendly consideration for others through practice of the Golden Rule; a fitting occasion to establish a high standard of personal conduct for all the days to follow and point the way, year by year, to a century of peace from each "Good Neighbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTROL OF PISTOLS AND OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. COOPER submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

JOINT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT INFORMATION PROGRAMS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the other day in commenting upon the program commonly referred to as the Voice of America I made a suggestion that the Congress should have additional information obtained by its own committees. I made the suggestion in the hope that the members of the majority party would submit a resolution. It has not been done to my knowledge. However, I have seen that the House Committee on Appropriations through a subcommittee is planning to conduct such an investigation. I realize the importance of this matter to the Appropriations Committee, but I believe a question of permanent policy is involved which ought to have consideration by the appropriate committee of the Senate. I have therefore drawn such a resolution and am offering it this morning with the request that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I said the other day that there was no pride of authorship and there is none. I ask unanimous consent to submit the concurrent resolution in the hope it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that the committee will take such action and make such changes as may be appropriate or proper.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on Government Information Programs (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee), which shall be composed of five members of the Senate (three from the majority party and two from the minority party) appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and five members of the House of Representatives (three from the majority party and two from the minority party) appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

Sec. 2. The joint committee shall—

(1) make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the nature, manner of performance, and effect of all activities carried out by the State Department or any other agency of the Government for the purpose of acquainting the peoples of foreign countries with the United States, its people and their activities, and the policies and objectives of its Government, including, without limitation:

(a) the policies and methods employed, and their objectives;

(b) the qualifications of all personnel engaged in any such activities;

(c) whether the costs of such activities are justified;

(d) whether such activities are a proper function of government or should be carried out by privately owned organizations, with or without subsidies; and

(2) report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, not later than January 15, 1948, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Sec. 3. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the joint committee shall not exceed \$. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent that the

Committee on the Judiciary may sit during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

THE MEANING OF LIBERTY IN INDUSTRY-LABOR RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Meaning of Liberty in Industry-Labor Relations," delivered by him at the inaugural program honoring Dr. Raymond Bernard Allen as president of the University of Washington, at Seattle, on May 22, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF RAISING OF AMERICAN FLAG IN NEW MEXICO—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR CHAVEZ AND HON. JOSEPH J. LAWLER

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses delivered by him and Hon. Joseph J. Lawler, Third Assistant Postmaster General, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on October 16, 1946, on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the raising of the American flag in the Territory of New Mexico, which appear in the Appendix.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him regarding reclamation and western projects before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations considering Interior Department appropriations, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD questions and answers prepared by him regarding Senate bill 984, having to do with elimination of discrimination in employment, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of education, delivered by him on March 27, 1947, at the State convention of the Alabama Educational Association, at Birmingham, Ala., which appears in the Appendix.]

SERMON BY VERY REV. IGNATIUS SMITH DURING TRIBUTE TO THE WAR DEAD

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the sermon delivered by the Very Reverend Ignatius Smith, of the Catholic University of America, on the occasion of the ninth annual military memorial mass, held in the Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery, Sunday, May 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Gavel of the Senate Is in Efficient Hands," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Star of May 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR LODGE'S VIEWS ON FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) UNION

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Lodge's Foreign Policy," published in the Springfield (Mass.) Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INTER-AMERICAN MILITARY COOPERATION ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a bill to be entitled "The Inter-American Military Cooperation Act" authorizing a program of military collaboration with other American states including the training, organization, and equipment of the armed forces of those countries.

I submitted a similar bill to the Seventy-ninth Congress and recommended at that time that the Congress give the bill favorable consideration and enact it. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives reported the bill with amendments to the Committee of the Whole House as H. R. 6326. This present draft agrees with H. R. 6326. World developments during the year that has passed give still greater importance to this legislation, and I again ask the Congress to give this bill favorable consideration and enact it.

As stated in my message to the Seventy-ninth Congress, our Army and Navy have maintained cordial relations of collaboration with the armed forces of other American Republics within the framework of the good-neighbor policy. Under authorization of the Congress, military and naval training missions have been sent to various American Republics. During the recent war, even prior to Pearl Harbor, this collaboration was intensively developed on the basis of inter-American undertakings for hemisphere defense. Training activities were expanded, and under the Lend-Lease Act limited amounts of military and naval equipment were made available to the other American Republics as part of the hemisphere defense program. Forces from two of the American republics participated in combat overseas, and others joined in the defense of the shores and seas of the Americas at a time when the danger of invasion of our continents was all too great.

The American Republics have assumed new responsibilities, for their mutual defense and for the maintenance of peace, in the Act of Chapultepec and the Charter of the United Nations. The close collaboration of the American Republics provided for in the Act of Chapultepec, the proposed treaty to be based upon that act, and other basic inter-American documents, make it highly desirable to standardize military organization, training methods, and equipment as has been recommended by the Inter-American Defense Board.

I can find no better way to describe the intent and purpose of this bill than to repeat my message to the Congress of May 6, 1946.

Under the bill transmitted herewith, the Army and Navy, acting in conjunction with the Department of State, would be permitted to continue in the future a general program of collabora-

tion with the armed forces of our sister Republics with a view to facilitating the adoption of similar technical standards. Certain additional training activities, not covered by existing legislation, would be permitted. The President would also be authorized to transfer military and naval equipment to the governments of other American states by sale or other method.

The collaboration authorized by the bill could be extended also to Canada, whose cooperation with the United States in matters affecting their common defense is of particular importance.

A special responsibility for leadership rests upon the United States in this matter because of the preponderant technical, economic, and military resources of this country. There is a reasonable and limited purpose for which arms and military equipment can rightfully be made available to the other American states. This Government will not, I am sure, in any way approve of, nor will it participate in, the indiscriminate or unrestricted distribution of armaments, which would only contribute to a useless and burdensome armaments race. It does not desire that operations under this bill shall raise unnecessarily the quantitative level of armament in the American Republics. To this end the bill specifies that amounts of nonstandard material shall be sought in exchange for United States equipment.

It is my intention that any operations under this bill, which the Congress may authorize, shall be in every way consistent with the wording and spirit of the United Nations Charter. The bill has been drawn up primarily to enable the American nations to carry out their obligations to cooperate in the maintenance of inter-American peace and security under the Charter and the Act of Chapultepec which is intended to be supplanted by a permanent inter-American treaty.

It is incumbent upon this Government to see that military developments in which we have a part are guided toward the maintenance of peace and security and that military and naval establishments are not encouraged beyond what security considerations require. In this connection the bill provides that operations thereunder are subject to any international agreement for the regulation of armaments to which the United States may become a party. In addition, provision will be made for continuing coordination of the actual operations under the legislation with developing plans and policy in the field of armaments regulation.

In executing this program it will be borne in mind, moreover, that it is the policy of this Government to encourage the establishment of sound economic conditions in the other American Republics which will contribute to the improvement of living standards and the advancement of social and cultural welfare. Such conditions are a prerequisite to international peace and security. Operations under the proposed legislation will be conducted with full and constant awareness that no encouragement should be given to the imposition upon other people of any useless burden of

armaments which would handicap the economic improvement which all countries so strongly desire. The execution of the program authorized by the bill will also be guided by a determination to guard against placing weapons of war in the hands of any groups who may use them to oppose the peaceful and democratic principles to which the United States and other American nations have so often subscribed.

In entering into agreements with other American states for the provision of training and equipment as authorized by the bill, the purposes of this program will be made clear to each of the other governments.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 1947.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, to strike out lines 4 to 10, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 2. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall continue, until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of wool in the continental United States and Territories at the price it supported wool in 1946.

On page 2, to strike out lines 7 to 19, inclusive; on page 2, line 20, to strike out "Sec. 4" and insert "Sec. 3"; on page 2, to strike out lines 24 and 25; and on page 3, to strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 4. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended and reenacted (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 7, sec. 624), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any one or more articles are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or the Wool Act of 1947, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigations shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees on, or such limitations on the total quantities of, any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary to prescribe in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or will not reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the

United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or the Wool Act of 1947: *Provided*, That no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantity of any article which may be imported from any country which reduces such permissible total quantity to less than 50 percent of the average annual quantity of such article which was imported from such country during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, both dates inclusive: *And provided further*, That no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantities of wool or products thereof which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption."

SEC. 5. The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me to make a point of no quorum?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the point agreeable to the Senator from Georgia, inasmuch as the time taken by the roll call is chargeable to both sides?

Mr. GEORGE. It is agreeable to us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Connor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bricker	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Jenner	Russell
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stewart
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Capper	Langer	Taylor
Chavez	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McCarran	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Eaton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I would like very much in the present session of Congress, if it is prudent to vote for tax reduction, to vote for a payment on the national debt, and for such financial program as would carry out those two very desirable objectives. Wartime taxes have been an enormous burden. A few of them have been eliminated; some of them have been modified; but, even so, the people of the Nation, both those poorly circumstanced and those well-to-do, are still carrying a tremendous amount of the burdens which war made necessary.

The question before the Senate is: Can we do these things now with that degree of certainty which would impel prudent men to take the necessary steps to carry these objectives into actual being? I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I want to say now that while the cuts in appropriations made in the House and those made in the Senate have been considerable, I think that all fair-minded men who will face the facts will agree that they have been very much less than what we hoped and expected could be accomplished when we voted on the separate measures providing for reductions in appropriations of \$6,000,000,000 and \$4,500,000,000, adopted by the House and Senate, respectively, some time ago.

Mr. President, I want to vote for tax reduction and for payment on the national debt with the reasonable knowledge that 14 months from now when the fiscal year 1948 draws to a close, I, as one Member of the Senate, shall not feel that I have overdone it, and will not again be confronted with another deficit.

For 17 years as a Member of this body I have lived under administrations that practiced deficit financing. Some of the Members of the Senate who have served all or a part of that time will remember that at almost every session of the Congress I have done what I could, both by speech on the floor and by vote in the Appropriations Committee, to try to get our budget in balance because, among other things, in my judgment not to do so was dangerous and unwise. The rise of Mussolini in Italy and the rise of Hitler in Germany came about more than anything else by reason of deficit financing in those two countries.

For 44 of the 66 years of the life of the royal Italian Government after the revolution led by Garibaldi, Italy practiced deficit financing. Almost every administration that ran for office in that country promised to balance the budget. Every administration, as soon as it got in power, immediately began to practice deficit financing to satisfy the clamor of

the people. Adequate taxes were temporarily postponed from time to time and in the end and then and then only, when the delayed taxes finally came, the Italian people found out that in proportion to the income of its people Italy was the heaviest-taxed nation on the face of the earth.

The same thing was true in Germany, where the tax system was primarily not lodged in the federal or central government, but in the states of Germany. Even the railroads paid separate taxes in each state rather than national taxes.

In the case of this rich and prosperous country I do not see any prospect of a dictator arising because of deficit financing. We have such great and varied resources, so much know-how, so much potential and intrinsic wealth in our people and in our soil, that I think it would stretch the truth to say that a reasonable continuance of deficit financing would bring on a dictator, and I do not wish to draw that inference. Nevertheless, a debt of \$260,000,000,000 is still a tremendous amount of a burden for the people of this Nation to carry, now that we have good times, and the opportunity has come to taper it off and whittle it down.

Recurring to the happenings of the present session of Congress, I remind the Senate that the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], introduced a measure to cut down Federal spending for the next fiscal year by \$4,500,000,000. The House of Representatives passed a similar measure, but fixed the amount at \$6,000,000,000. What are the prospects of reaching either of those goals? Here is what has actually happened up to now, and as I read these figures keep in mind that only one of the regular appropriation bills for the next year has been passed by both branches of the Congress.

The appropriation for the Labor Department and for the Federal Security Agency was reduced \$103,000,000. The appropriation for the Treasury and Post Office Departments was reduced \$56,000,000. The appropriation for the Interior Department was reduced \$134,000,000. The appropriation for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments was reduced \$160,000,000. The appropriation for the Navy Department was reduced \$377,000,000. The appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, just reported in the House, was reduced \$375,000,000. Thus if we add the actual cuts in appropriations made in bills which have either passed the House or been reported to the House, we find over-all cuts so far in nine of the principal departments of the Government to the extent of only \$1,205,000,000.

I am not counting the \$800,000,000 of tax refund money which was taken out of the Treasury appropriation bill, because that does not represent a reduction in expenditures. Of the \$1,600,000,000 set aside for this purpose, the Congress determined to leave only \$800,000,000 in the bill, upon the theory that if tax reductions exceeded \$800,000,000, the amount provided for by the House—and which will probably be provided for by the Senate—there would be a separate bill to appropriate the money for

any additional tax refunds we might have to make. But that is mere book-keeping. The point is that there was no real reduction of expenditures by that transaction.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not a tax refund almost like interest on the debt? It is an obligation which we must pay, is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course it is an obligation of the Government. We cannot tell how much the obligation will be. The President wanted the amount to be ample. The House thought that half the amount recommended would be ample.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Interior Department bill has not yet been reported to the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming to that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. And the Agriculture bill has not passed the House or Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming to that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is obvious from newspaper comments and other reports that appropriations contained in those bills will be substantially increased before they reach the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. But even conceding for the moment that there will be no increase in those appropriations in either the House or the Senate, the unassailable truth of the matter is that the extent of the actual proposed cuts in expenditures in all those bills, including the Agriculture appropriation bill, represents a total of \$1,205,000,000. That is a fact which cannot be denied. The total reductions in expenditures up to this good hour assuming that no additions will be made to the appropriations when they reach the Senate, amount to \$1,205,000,000. Where is the \$4,500,000,000 cut which we, with high ideals and endeavors, set as the goal in this body several months ago? Where is the \$6,000,000,000 cut to which the House dedicated its effort? There remain only the Army appropriation bill and the independent offices appropriation bill, in addition to one or two minor appropriation bills which do not involve large sums of money. So even if we were to make a drastic cut in the Army appropriation bill, we could not reach a cut of \$6,000,000,000, because the Army appropriation bill is only for approximately \$6,000,000,000. We would not have a corporal's guard left if the remaining bills were cut to such an extent that a \$6,000,000,000 reduction would be possible. Indeed, it is doubtful if they could be cut to such an extent as to produce a reduction of \$4,500,000,000.

These appropriation bills deal with the period of time beginning July 1 next and extending to July 1, 1948. It is called the fiscal year 1948. Therefore, nothing has happened in the Senate to date to give a prudent man justification for assuming that appropriations will be reduced to

the extent of more than approximately \$2,000,000,000, less than half of what the Senate promised the people in its resolution of several months ago, and about a third of what the House promised the people at the same time.

It is significant that the House and Senate have been unable to agree, even at this late stage, as to how much of a reduction can be made. So far there has been a failure of the conferees of the House and Senate even to agree that four and a half billion, five billion, or six billion can actually be cut from Federal expenditures.

Therefore we shall not be able to effect a saving of three and a half billion dollars by reducing expenditures. Already we have been over 9 of the 12 departments of the Government, and we have reduced their appropriations \$1,205,000,000. We have three departments left. In my judgment we shall not be able to reduce expenditures by \$3,200,000,000.

What do the advocates of "act now" suggest? They say, "This is a great year. Income is soaring. The people are prosperous. There is a great deal of money in the country. Corporations are making enormous profits. This condition will continue for the next 14 months. There will be no substantial dip. There will be no loss in Federal revenue. Profits will continue, and therefore tax revenues will continue." They say that if that situation continues for 14 months longer, we can expect \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 more in revenue in the Federal Treasury than we anticipated we would have, so great are profits and earnings and income-tax payments of both corporations and individuals into the Federal Treasury.

Apparently no one else shares that view. I do not often read the stock-market page, but in the past 3 or 4 months I have noticed that the prices of stocks have declined, many of them as much as 50 percent. Billions of dollars of paper values have disappeared. If the statements of our friends on the other side are accurate, if we are to have continued high profits for another 14 months, why is it that the investors of the country do not realize it? Based upon such a supposition, stocks can be bought on the New York stock exchange today which would yield a return of 8 or 10 percent on investment, assuming that the present high level of profits will continue for another 14 months.

When we boil the situation down, what do we make of it? The proposed tax reduction and debt reduction are predicated upon two things: First, that there is to be an ultimate reduction in taxes of between \$4,500,000,000 and \$5,000,000,000; second, that income coming into the Treasury from large profits will continue for another 14 months.

The latter of those two propositions is in the realm of pure speculation. It may happen. It may be that revenues will be even greater than we estimate. However, 14 months in this war-torn and sick world is a long time. As conditions now exist, looking ahead 14 months is like looking ahead 10 years in the early twenties or in the early 1900's. The whole world is in turmoil. We have not settled down from this terrific war, and there-

fore we are not in a position to prophesy or predict what will happen in the next 14 months.

My able colleague, the eminent Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], because of his long service in this body, because of his vast experience in the handling of fiscal matters for the Government—he has had more such experience than has any other man in this Chamber—judicial by temperament, moderately conservative by temperament on financial matters, has asked the Congress one thing only in the form of the motion which is pending. Says the Senator from Georgia, "Why do we not wait until the 10th of June? That is only 3 weeks away. By that time all the appropriation bills will have reached the floor of the House of Representatives, and we can then see the extent of the proposed cuts suggested by the House Appropriations Committee. If those cuts are sufficient to warrant a tax reduction, all well and good. If they are not sufficient and we act beforehand, we will have reduced taxes beyond the point of prudence." He asks only that we have all the facts before us. If the facts are as predicted in some quarters, I shall be in favor of tax reduction. If, on the other hand, they are not as predicted, then I should want to modify the proposal of the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

In reading the newspaper this morning I was astounded to find that the very able and industrious Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in a Nation-wide radio address, as reported in the press, had made the statement that he had no fear of a deficit for the year 1948, assuming that the tax-reduction bill becomes a law. In other words, the Senator made the prediction that for the next 14 months business would boom; there would be no recession sufficient to prevent the raising of revenue which would, at all events, balance the Federal budget. It seemed to me that he was taking in a great deal of territory. I am utterly at a loss to know why, with billions upon billions of dollars in the banks of the country, with billions of dollars in the portfolios of the insurance companies, with stocks away down, and with dividends on stocks at present away up, the public is reluctant to invest. Certainly the investors do not share the optimism of the Senator from Ohio. We can examine the big-board Stock Exchange list and read the dividends and then look at the prices at which stocks are selling, and, assuming that the dividends hold up, we could make scores of investments today, based on the dividends and the present prices, which would yield 8, 10, 12, or, in some cases, 15 percent on the investment. Yet no one buys. The great moneyed interests of the country, which quite often find themselves in the majority in the party across the aisle, do not share this optimism. We are here to chart a course for our Government, which ought to be predicated on proof, not on the uncertainties that may arise at home and abroad. In the estimate which I have read, to point to some of those uncer-

tainties, I have not taken into account the \$400,000,000 that has recently been appropriated for Greece and Turkey, and \$350,000,000 for relief. I understand that other bills are coming. Who knows that but before this session is over we may have other bills which will carry foreign expenditures beyond the billion-dollar mark? It was only at the last session of Congress that we passed a bill carrying more than \$3,000,000,000 for Great Britain. It was called a loan. In my opinion, it was not a loan at all. I doubt that much of it will be paid back or can be paid back by the British Government.

All of these things are hanging loose in the air, and yet this proposal is made before we know anything about the amount of the cuts. We should not anticipate that they will be greater than we now know they will be. In my judgment, when many of the bills which have been reported to the House or acted upon by the House come before the Senate there is no question that many of them will have some of the cuts restored to them. Already the Republican Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN] has said that \$180,000,000 of the cut in the Agriculture Department bill ought to be restored. Already western Senators on both sides of the aisle are saying that the cuts in the Interior Department bill having to do with reclamation and irrigation should be restored. If those things come to pass—and we have already made many restorations in other appropriation bills in the Senate Committee on Appropriations—then the \$1,205,000,000 of the \$9,000,000,000 already reported to the House will shrink, in all probability, to six hundred or seven hundred or eight hundred millions of dollars. That will represent all the cuts in all of the bills so far reported to or acted upon by the Senate.

Therefore, we have only the Army and the Veterans' Bureau to fall back on. In my judgment, we are not going to save \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 out of either one of those appropriation bills, or even both of them put together. The Navy bill has been reported with a cut of \$377,000,000; and it would be very unusual if a considerable amount of that sum does not find its way back into the bill before it finally passes both branches of the Congress.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and I served in the House together some years ago. I do not want to reflect on the House at all, but there was a policy over there then, which still exists, that when they are ready to make a cut in an appropriation bill they make it as much as they think it ought to be, or perhaps a little beyond, and each Member of the House says "The Senate has to review it anyhow, and when it gets over there they will look into it again, and if the agency or department deserves the extra money the Senate will put it back into the bill."

So these figures which I have read this morning are the maximum amount of cuts, the maximum suggested even by the committee. The House must yet act on them, and then they must run the gantlet of the Senate Appropriations

Committee, the Senate itself, and then a conference of the two Houses.

I repeat, that up to this good hour, for Labor and Federal Security the reduction has been only \$103,000,000; for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, \$56,000,000; for the Interior Department, \$134,000,000; State, Justice, and Commerce, \$160,000,000; Navy Department, \$377,000,000; Department of Agriculture, \$375,000,000; making a total of \$1,205,000,000 as to bills on which neither the House nor the Senate has acted and as to which the percentage of restoration will be considerable.

Yet in the face of all that we speak of reducing taxes by three and one-fourth billions of dollars, and we say we shall pay on the national debt \$2,600,000,000, making approximately \$6,000,000,000. When asked, "Where are the cuts to justify this action?" the reply is made, "We have estimates; we have beliefs; we have suppositions that the income of the Government will continue high for the next 14 months, to the same extent it has existed in the first part of 1947, and that will cause more money to come into the Treasury than we had expected, and thus we will have enough." That notwithstanding the fact that we have not cut appropriations sufficiently to make the tax reduction to enable us to pay this amount on the national debt.

The Senator from Ohio—and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at this time—said in his radio address last night—and I had one of the best laughs on my way down in the train, as I read the report of his address, that I have had for a long while—that the Democrats were playing politics with tax reduction. "The Democrats," said my good friend, the industrious and able Senator from Ohio, "are playing politics with tax reduction."

My fellow Senators, it is admitted on the floor that in 9 of the major 12 appropriation bills, even if every cut recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the House holds fast, the cuts amount to only \$1,205,000,000; and there is not a Senator on this floor who will not concede that that amount of cut will not hold when it runs the gantlet of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate itself. Yet we hear the cry of "politics." I know that the Senator is not a candidate for the Presidency, and I know he would be the last one—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. I extend the time of the Senator from Maryland by 10 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I was saying, I know that my good friend the Senator from Ohio would be the last one to play politics in this matter, because he is thoroughly detached. He is as high as he wishes to go. He considers the office of Senator one of the great offices of the Nation and of the world, and I do not believe he could be induced to run for a higher office. Therefore, when he says that the proposed tax reductions should be made now, notwithstanding that the appropriation cuts are only one-quarter

of what was promised a few months ago, and notwithstanding the fact that the proposed tax reductions are predicated on the assumption that good times will prevail for the next 14 months, I know that my good friend the Senator from Ohio is not thinking in terms of politics and, heaven knows, he is not thinking in terms of the next national election, because all of us here know that he will not be a candidate then, even if they draft him and seek to compel him to run, and all of us know that there is no politics at all in putting through a tax bill before we have the appropriations bills on which to predicate the tax-reduction bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has been speaking of politics, and let me suggest that he is getting on somewhat touchy ground.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have found that everything here is contagious. Perhaps I have been taking too seriously the position of our good friend across the aisle with respect to Republican tax cuts, which have been only about 25 percent of what was promised.

Mr. President, there is just one course that the Senate should adopt in this matter, and every Member of the Senate knows in his heart what it is: We should do what is best for the welfare of our country. Taxes cannot properly be reduced now on the basis of future cuts in expenditures. There is not a Member of this body or of the body at the other end of the Capitol who could do that.

I make the prophecy with respect to the nine appropriation bills which have already been passed by the House of Representatives—leaving out the three to come—that when they finally pass both Houses of Congress, the total cuts will not amount to \$1,000,000,000. In making that statement, I leave out of account the extra appropriations which we have made for aid and relief to Greece and Turkey; I make the capitulation without taking them into account. I say that the total expenditure cuts will not be \$1,000,000,000. There is not a thing to support prudence in this matter except the expectation, which is a very doubtful one, that good times will continue for the next 14 months, and that there will be such an avalanche of revenues into the Treasury that notwithstanding the reduction or lack of reduction in the cutting of expenditures, there still will be enough revenue to permit the reduction of taxes and the balancing of the national budget.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator to let me finish this remark: I shall yield to him in a minute.

Mr. President, when we had the \$4,500,000,000 budget-reduction bill before us, I went to the other side of the aisle and said to some of my good friends there, "I think you gentlemen are very short-sighted to support a tentative reduction of \$4,500,000,000 in the budget. Why do you not make it two and one-half or three billion dollars, and then shoot for \$6,000,000,000? If you go be-

yond what you promise the people, that will be all to the good; but if you fall far short of what you promise, you will be a proper subject of ridicule for not being able to measure your own prowess in the field of reduction of Government expenditures."

But, Mr. President, the pressure was so strong from the other side of the Chamber that the Senate set the ceiling at \$4,500,000,000 anyhow, just as Senators on the other side of the aisle are talking now. Mr. President, is there one Member of either branch of Congress who, from the point of view of the actual reduction of expenditures, will now rise and say that we shall save, from a reduction of expenditures, \$4,500,000,000? The estimates were totally haywire then; they were totally exaggerated. But, now, Senators are proceeding with something which means a great deal more. The measure previously before us was only an idle resolution, whereas the measure now before us means the financial integrity of the United States Government.

I remember that after World War I, the Government bonds went down to 80, 81, or 82. So far they are up; but, as the Senator from Georgia pointed out the other day, in our present financing on the basis of short-term notes and what-not, in excess of \$50,000,000,000 of Government obligations are floating around, and they might be dumped on the Treasury without notice.

Now I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, but I ask him not to be long, please.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Maryland for his statements regarding the national income and his references to the declines which have occurred in the stock market. I should like to say to him that the figures at home and from the Bureau of Internal Revenue show a continuous falling off each month. There have been marked declines in the commodity market. For instance, cotton sold at 35 or 40 cents last year, but for next year's delivery is selling at 30 cents; and lumber has declined in price, and potatoes have declined. The commodities in the South now are bringing in only the support prices, and today the Government is having to take in the potato crop.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to be a calamity howler, but let me point out what we find. The Glenn Martin Co., one of the big aviation companies of the United States, has closed down. The steel concerns are curtailing their operations. There is a threatened coal strike in the offing as of the 1st of July. No one knows how it will be handled or how long it will last. The stock market has gone down and down and down. During the last 4 or 5 months it has been possible to buy, at the prevailing rate, plenty of stocks which would pay 12 percent or 14 percent, but no one has been buying. Yet our friends on the other side of the aisle, who purport to speak for the large interests of the country, are saying that good times are going to continue, and that for the next 14 months the income of the Government will exceed all estimates by \$3,000,000,000,

or \$4,000,000,000, or \$5,000,000,000, or \$6,000,000,000.

All that the Senator from Georgia asks is that we wait until these cuts are finally made, and that with the definite appropriation figures before us we then proceed into the field of tax reduction.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the Senator from Maryland agree with me that it is most encouraging to find the majority party constantly predicting a \$180,000,000,000 of national income? Of course, I hope the national income reaches that figure. If it does, that will be a genuine endorsement of the Democratic Party.

Mr. TYDINGS. It certainly will be. If the national income does continue at a high level, I do not believe the majority party will give us the credit for it. But if the national income declines, they will give us the devil for it, even though their tax-reduction bill at this time may be the one thing that will force it down quickly.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk about inflation. I shall not go into that subject; but if the taxes are reduced at this time, the effect will be to put more money into the people's pockets, thus making it all the easier for them to buy the limited number of things which are available for purchase. Such a situation is not conducive to a reduction of prices, in my judgment. Personally, I can stand having some tax reduction, as can every other citizen of the United States. But that is not the point in connection with this matter. The point is that we should know what the future reasonably holds in store for us, before we go to the extent of reducing taxes, and doing so before we finish appropriating, and without any thorough knowledge of what the expenditure cuts will be.

So, Mr. President, just as the leadership on the other side of the aisle missed the target by a wide margin in setting a \$4,500,000,000 reduction goal in connection with the legislative budget, so I feel that they will miss the tax-and-debt-reduction target by a wide margin again. I feel that when the Congress meets next January—although I hope I am wrong—there is going to be a trifle of embarrassment on the other side of the aisle.

I feel that many good men who are going to vote for some of the proposals made without being able to look ahead, will be somewhat sorry, particularly if we suffer a little depression during the summer, and their faces are going to be a little red as they go to the voters in next year's election.

The prudent course, therefore, would be to adopt the motion of the Senator from Georgia, and wait and see what the cuts are, and then frame the tax bill so as to fit Government finances. The Senator from Ohio said a few days ago that we should fit finances to taxes. I say we should fit the taxes to the finances. It is not possible to run a business in any other way than on the basis of knowing what one's income is going to be and what the expenses will be.

I hope the mistake made after the last war will not be repeated, when money

was sent abroad from this country so that purchasers abroad would have money with which to finance purchases here. Now Senators are shooting at tax reduction, and I do not believe it is advisable or prudent at this time. In my opinion, before the session next year is very old, many Senators will find that they have opened Pandora's box, for when taxes are once reduced after a war, they cannot successfully be raised in the face of the pressure groups which would oppose such increases, or their restoration after they are once off the books. The cat will then be out of the bag, and it will be too late.

There are 3 weeks left for us to look at the picture of our economic situation, and I implore my colleagues to take the prudent view, in the interest of national solvency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it has not been easy to determine how to vote on the question of postponing consideration of income-tax reduction.

I believe that the majority policy committee was in error in bringing this bill before the Senate before it had been decided what the appropriations would be for the ensuing year, but now that the matter is before us, we have to determine whether we should continue with it and dispose of it now or lay it on the table for consideration at a later date.

I have consistently taken the position that we should first of all determine what amount is necessary to maintain essential Government services. Having done this, we should make sure that the budget is entirely balanced.

We should provide for a reduction of from three to five billion dollars in the national debt.

Then—and only then—can we reasonably determine the extent to which tax reduction may be made.

Even these things, however, are not easily determined because we must take into consideration the probable amount of income and this appears to be the most difficult part of the problem.

Less than 2 years ago, Republican leaders of the Senate estimated a national income of not more than \$120,000,000,000 for the postwar era. This estimate has been proven very inaccurate.

The estimate of income made by the executive department for the current fiscal year has also been proven wrong, thus showing the difficulty of predicting both the national income and governmental receipts, even 1 year in advance.

Fortunately, both the estimates made by the Republican leadership in 1945 as to national income and the estimates made by the Budget Bureau for governmental income have fallen far short of both national income and Government receipts.

It is entirely proper that estimates of tax receipts should be conservative. It is better to have a balance than a deficit.

In regard to estimates of Government income for the year 1947, we find the

executive department estimating \$38,800,000,000 based on a national income of \$168,000,000,000, whereas the Republican leadership of the Senate estimates a Government income of \$41,200,000,000 to be derived from a national income of 170 plus billion.

As one reads official reports and financial and business reports in the press, the only conclusion to draw is that both these estimates are underestimates.

Only yesterday the New York Times carried the story of industrial profits being at a record level for this year.

A survey of 942 companies in 79 fields shows that in 1946 they earned 34 percent over the 1945 record.

With 5 months of the calendar 1947 almost gone, industrial profits are showing a wide increase over even the 1946 profits.

With no break in the huge backlog of unfilled business in sight, only a major unforeseen calamity can prevent the year 1947 from being the greatest year in history so far as our national income is concerned.

Such being the case, I believe it is safe to say that the estimate of \$41,200,000,000 of Federal receipts for the year 1947, which has been given us by the chairman of the Finance Committee, is indeed conservative.

In fact, it seems to me that those who scoffed at the estimate of \$150,000,000,000 of national income a couple of years ago can well reconcile themselves to a national income of \$200,000,000,000 in the near future if we as a nation make the most of our opportunities.

Let us now consider the matter of appropriations. The President has requested appropriations to the amount of \$37,500,000,000 for the coming year. Republican leaders in the House and Senate estimate that this amount should be cut from \$4,500,000,000 to \$6,000,000,000. In my opinion, both the President and the Republican leadership are wrong. My work as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has convinced me that substantial savings in Government expenses can be made without sacrificing in any degree essential services of Government. I do not know how great these savings can be. I am satisfied that administrative expenses have been excessive, that unnecessary personnel has and is being employed. I agree that there was an excuse for this in the last decade when it was necessary to employ many persons somewhere at some cost in order to keep relief rolls down, but certainly employment of superfluous personnel is unwarranted at a time when our national economy is at its peak.

It is my belief that administrative costs of the Federal Government may well be reduced 20 percent over-all. I am speaking only of administrative costs, and not of Government expenditures. There are many expenditures which cannot or should not be reduced in the slightest.

The Congress has made definite commitments to the States. The Congress has made definite commitments along the lines of social legislation in the form of grants-in-aid. These commitments

should be kept. Not only is national integrity concerned, but continuance of national economy at its present high level is also involved. We must keep our pledges, explicit and implied.

We must provide the funds for our highway program, our program of airport expansion, and for the building of new hospitals. We must not only keep our pledges to old people and the blind and the crippled and the dependent children, but I believe we should materially increase such assistance. We must not impair the health of the Nation's children by eliminating or reducing the school-lunch program.

We must not permit a return to the old days of mining the soil—the soil, that is the most precious and necessary of all our heritage—by reducing or discontinuing the soil-improvement program.

We must not court the possibility of famine in foreign nations by reducing the incentive to our farmers to produce record crops in order to save a few million dollars.

At a time when the world is in a state of political and economic confusion and there is continued talk of war, we must not be niggardly in respect to developing the natural resources of America, for the very security of our Nation depends upon our ability to defend ourselves against all comers until such time as the nations of the earth recover their equilibrium and agree upon an international plan for peace.

Besides providing money for the continuance of these programs so necessary to our national welfare and our national security, we should without delay provide for material assistance to the educational systems of the 48 States unless we are willing to turn our backs upon our schools and the boys and girls of the coming generation.

All these things must be taken into consideration in determining whether and to what extent we can reduce the tax bills of our citizens.

It is out of the question to say that the President's budget of \$37,500,000,000 cannot be reduced at all without materially affecting services of Government. In the light of reductions in appropriations which have been made and prospects for future reductions, it would be no less than folly to say that Government expenses can be reduced \$6,000,000,000 or even \$4,500,000,000 at this time without materially reducing the services which the people of this Nation demand and have a right to receive.

Assuming, however, that Government receipts will total \$42,000,000,000 and budget requests are reduced \$2,500,000,000 to a total of \$39,500,000,000, there would be left \$7,000,000,000 to apply to new appropriations, such as Federal aid to education, debt reduction, and tax reduction.

I believe that an estimate of \$7,000,000,000 for these purposes is not exaggerated, but rather a conservative estimate. Such being the case, it is possible to enact a tax reduction bill at this time without jeopardizing national security.

I do believe the bill should be amended so as to provide a greater amount of this reduction to those who need it most and

who, through the purchase of necessities of life, would contribute most to a further expansion of our national economy.

In the light of all that has been said on this floor and in view of the information which I have received as a result of studies made independently of either side in this controversy, I am led to believe that an over-all tax reduction not exceeding \$3,200,000,000 can be made without jeopardizing our ability to reduce the national debt and without reducing those services of Government which contribute materially to the welfare of our people and the security of our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I arise in opposition to the motion requesting delay in considering the tax-reduction bill until June 10, made by our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Georgia. Those who would favor this motion fall into two classes: First, those who believe that no tax reduction should be made; second, those who favor a tax reduction but contend that we will be in a better position to determine the amount of such reduction at the later date now proposed. For my part, I am satisfied that there is need for tax reduction and for immediate action to bring it about.

Let us consider first those who believe no tax reduction should be made at all. They subdivide into two categories: Senators who want neither tax reduction nor reduction in Federal expenditures, and Senators who would cut Federal expenses and would apply the savings entirely to other purposes, such as reducing the national debt and providing money for foreign relief and assistance in other forms.

To the first category—those who are opposed to any tax reduction—apparently, the \$260,000,000 debt is not alarming. To them the \$7,500 Federal indebtedness per family of this Nation is a small matter, even though indebtedness in lesser amounts has resulted in bankrupting nation after nation over the face of the globe.

The cost of the Federal Government and the burden it places upon the people of our Nation does not even appear to be of minor concern to this group. The \$37,500,000,000 Presidential budget is accepted by them as fair and reasonable, in spite of the fact that the highest previous peacetime expenditures were only \$9,000,000,000. Prior to 1932 the highest annual peacetime expenditure by the Federal Government was only \$4,000,000,000. For example, in 1940 the Department of Commerce spent about \$75,000,000, which was \$43,000,000 more than was expended by Herbert Hoover in his biggest spending year as Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Hoover's expenditure was branded by the late President Roosevelt in the campaign of 1932 as so high

as to be an outrageous injustice to the taxpayers. But now the Presidential budget calls for an expenditure of \$260,000,000 for this same department.

In 1940 the Department of the Interior spent \$71,000,000, but now it asks six hundred and sixty-three million. In 1940 the Department of Labor spent \$18,000,000. But now it is asking one hundred and six millions. In 1940 the Post Office Department operated on forty-five million, but now it wants \$356,000,000.

The independent offices are now asking for \$5,500,000,000 more than they expended in 1940. To me this is shocking. It points out that at the end of the road we shall find national bankruptcy unless we rein in sharply—not later, but now.

Mr. President, I find, however, a wide area of common ground with those who recognize the need for curtailing Government expenditure, even though they would apply all savings so achieved to purposes other than tax reduction. It is, indeed, strange—but refreshing—to hear certain of our colleagues and other leaders advocate the application of our entire saving toward reduction of the national debt. When I came to the Senate I had much the same feeling. I, too, would like to be able to see the national debt reduced by the full amount of the savings. But my study of the subject and consultation with citizens in all walks of life has convinced me that it is not in the best interest of America and the American people to permit the present excessively high wartime tax rates to continue unchanged. To do so would dry up the productivity of America. Risk capital would not venture out into channels of industry and commerce. In the end, the national income would be reduced and the revenues to the Federal Government would be decreased rather than increased.

What we must do here is to assure our people that its Congress is not trying to destroy incentive. We are at a point where the law of diminishing returns has set in and where sterility will begin to affect the free-enterprise system. The way to insure against such a condition is to lift some of the burden from the shoulders of those who want to contribute fresh mortar and bricks to the building of a more powerful and stronger America. For that reason, I say, some of the Federal savings should be allowed to remain in the savings of the people to be used for productive purposes and to contribute to an expanding economy for the Nation.

And now we come to the group which believes in both cutting governmental costs and in effecting tax reduction, but who argue that we will be in a better position to determine the amount of tax reduction after June 10.

I see nothing to be gained by further delay. I do not believe that the information we will have then will differ materially from what is before us now.

What has happened up to now in the cutting of budget requests provides a blueprint of what is to come. We know that we shall make good the promises to wring out the water and hack away the deadwood.

Certainly, I find it impossible to believe that any Member of the Senate doubts for a moment that the present Congress is cutting and will continue to cut deeply into the tangled jungle of bureaucratic spending.

I cannot foresee any appreciable error resulting from acting now. But even if there should be such error, it would be offset by the great advantage of assuring the American people that its Congress is acting without delay to redeem promises of economy and tax reductions that have gone unredeemed since 1932.

Millions of our citizens have been living in hope for the last 15 years that part of the staggering burden of excessive taxation would be lifted from their backs. Any miscalculation that we might make will be far outweighed by the incentive that we are giving our people to go ahead and keep business and employment in high gear.

Mr. President, with the disturbing reports from business statisticians everywhere, that kind of incentive can hardly be measured by dollars alone.

Let me point out, too, that if we cut the taxes now, and if we know we have to reduce appropriations because of that cut, we will reduce, and we will be more diligent in our search for wasteful spending to be pruned from the widespread tree of Government bureaucracy.

There is also this mechanical feature which is most important. It is our plan to have these income-tax reductions become effective July 1 next, and that is only a little time in the future. Millions of our people are on a weekly withholding basis with their employers. This means that tens of thousands of firms across the country must revamp their operations and do it without delay if they are to be able to deduct the proper amounts beginning July 1. It means that the Treasury must also make changes and amend its regulations and forms. These things cannot be done at the drop of a hat. They take time and work. Time is now very short. Let us give these people as much time as we can. Let us not pull a rabbit out of the hat at the last minute. Let us avoid the colossal confusion which would result and would bring ridicule upon Congress if we delay too long.

Because I think it would be of interest to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I call their attention to a poll made by the Philadelphia Bulletin indicating the opinions of the people of that area on the subject of an immediate tax cut. According to the Philadelphia Bulletin tabulation, 63 percent wanted a tax cut now, 28 percent were willing to wait until next year, and 9 percent had formed no opinion.

And mark this—of the Republicans who voted in the poll, 60 percent wanted an immediate tax reduction and only 29 percent were willing to wait.

Of the Democrats who voted, 67 percent were recorded in favor of immediate action, and only 27 percent indicated a willingness to wait.

An editorial appearing in the May 12 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer, one of America's leading newspapers,

captioned "Tax relief needn't await budget cut" said in part:

To pave the way for tax reduction, the House voted to slash \$6,000,000,000 from Mr. Truman's new top-heavy budget. The Senate cut it by four and a half billions.

It ought to have been possible to get together long before this on a compromise figure. The protesting Senators, as has been said, are right in opposing further delay.

But they are wrong in withholding their support of any tax relief at this session until they are certain just how much the swollen Federal budget is to be reduced, down to the last dollar.

This is the position taken by at least some of the Senators, while many of their Democratic colleagues are obstinately opposing any help for taxpayers, no matter what economies are effected.

The real question that has been holding up budget reduction is how best to allot the savings. Those who demand that the whole sum or a major part of it be applied to debt reduction have been engaging in a tug-of-war with supporters of tax relief first, with a reasonably moderate payment on the public debt.

The case for tax relief first was so strongly impressed on the House by such outstanding authorities as the two former Under Secretaries of the Treasury, John W. Hanes and Roswell Magill, that it went ahead and passed its tax-cut bill 6 weeks ago by a vote of virtually 2 to 1.

Senators who threaten to block tax relief until they know exactly how much expenses are to be trimmed are ignoring the way tax revenues have been increasing under present wartime rates.

To sum it up: The people want tax relief for all and they want it now. Substantial easing of the tax burden now will contribute to that end. There is no need to know just how much expenses are going to be cut before reducing tax rates.

Finally, there should be a stop to playing politics with tax relief. Why should it be delayed until election year affords an opportunity for the administration to take the lead in doing something for the taxpayers? Despite the stand by obstructionist Senators and President Truman, let Congress assume its responsibility, perform its plain duty, and earn the thanks of the American people.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me quote from one of the best-known Americans of the twentieth century, as follows:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and are paid through production. If those taxes are excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, in tax-sold farms, and in hordes of hungry people, tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain.

All Senators remember that statement made in the Presidential campaign of 1932 by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

With all my heart and soul I endorse that statement and commend it to those who followed his leadership as well as to the followers of Jefferson, Jackson, and Cleveland. I suggest, however, that we practice what he preached rather than preach what he practiced.

Mr. President, the immediate consideration of this bill is of vital importance to the economy of our country. Today is the time to defeat the motion of our distinguished, able, and respected senior Senator from Georgia.

To my colleagues I offer a very old but still sound slogan: "Let us not put off until tomorrow what we can do today."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, out of order I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of a technical amendment to the pending bill. I believe there is no objection to the amendment from the other side.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is no objection to the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 14, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "entitled under" and insert "entitled, or would be entitled if she were an employee receiving wages, under".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, arguments which are plausible have been made against the reduction of income taxes before we accomplish all we expect to do in reducing Government expenditures and cutting the budget.

To me, those arguments do not seem to be sufficient to delay us in saying to the American people, "Right now we are going to do something which lies within our power to give you new faith and hope in the future; something that will renew your interest in investing capital in businesses which are not perfectly sure of making a profit; something to stimulate research that may produce future earnings and profits, a fair part of which will remain with the producer; something that will let you know that you can afford to take this or that reasonable risk because if you win, you can keep a little more of what you make than you have been keeping under the burdensome taxes that have been laid upon you by your Government."

Mr. President, I go even further, and say that if the present Congress gives evidence of a desire to be thrifty and saving and economical with the people's money, procured through the power of taxation, it may be the beginning of a rebuilding of the moral fiber of the people of the United States.

We should do something right now that will say to the man who is working 6 days a week for the Government, "We are trying to fix it up so that you will only be working 5 days a week for the Government"; something that will say to the man who has been working 5 days a week for the Government, "We are trying to fix it up so that you will only be working 4 days a week for the Government"; something that will say to the man who has been working 4 days a week for the Government, "We are trying to fix it so you will only be working 3 days a week for the Government"; something that says to each one of them all the way

down the line, "We are trying to fix it up so that if you do something worth while to promote the welfare of the industrial system of the United States, you will be able to keep enough from what you earn so that you can provide a fund for yourself and your family for rainy days and not have to look forward to nothing but charity or special consideration from the Government and, at that, a Government which has become socialistic."

The prime difference between the United States of America today and many of the formerly great European countries, as well as other nations throughout the world, is that in many of them the people are working 7 days a week for the Government.

The people in those countries are taking what a dictator government tells them they can have. They are doing what that government tells them they must do, and they are enjoying only the small part of freedom which that government tells them they can enjoy, according to the will or whim of the dictator at the particular time.

We have gone far enough away from our American system already so that men are working all the way from part of a day a week to 6 days a week for the Government without compensation.

The proposed tax bill is a move which, in my opinion, is timed not one moment too soon to say to the American people, "We want you to get away from working for the Government as much as you have been. Your Representatives in Congress wish to heed the admonition of Chief Justice John Marshall, when he said, 'The power to tax also contains the power to destroy.'"

In the light of the facts which have been set so clearly before the Senate, namely, the opinion of the Congress that the budget can be cut a minimum of four and five-tenths—and I say that advisedly, because that is the decision of the Senate, which is one and one-half billion dollars less than the House figure—billion dollars, the best obtainable opinion that the national income payment in more than reasonable probability will run \$170,000,000,000 a year or more, and in the light of the cost of living, I believe we should not delay one moment putting into effect the income-tax reductions and provisions contained in H. R. 1, as amended by the Senate Finance Committee.

Certainly it is foolish to imagine that we shall have a picture on June 10 which is more clear and more definite than the picture we now have to justify taking action then, which some on the other side of the aisle would avoid taking now. I say that because between now and June 10 we shall know more about some things but we may know less about some others.

I would like it far better if we had already cut the appropriations \$6,000,000,000. Some of the ablest men in the country who are interested in the welfare of the Nation, have stated that the budget can and should be cut a minimum of \$6,000,000,000.

I stated on the Senate floor at the time I discussed the budget that there are two ways for this Nation of ours to become communistic. One is through attack upon us by external forces which have

the power to force us to their will—which will and objective are communism. The other is for that external force to sit silently by and watch us spend ourselves into national bankruptcy which would end in some new form of government, and, in my opinion, without doubt, socialism or communism.

America was not built by knowing all the facts in advance, but it was built by able men using the experience of the past as a foundational guide for acts in the future.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] showed very clearly in his speech to the Senate the other day that we have never been guaranteed the facts, nor have we, with absolute accuracy, diagnosed what was in front of us.

We have known a considerable part of the facts and diagnosed them with reasonable accuracy, but I contend that what we shall know on June 10 will not be of any more value to us than what we know today.

The Nation is waiting for some encouraging word from this Congress that we are going to return to the principles of taxation for revenue, and not remain with taxation for the redistribution of property.

Nothing can be more important to the future of this country than to encourage its private citizens to make plans for the future on the basis of keeping a fair share of the reward available as an incentive to accomplishment.

There is no way to wave a magic wand 2 years from today and bring into existence instantly the things which need to be brought into existence by setting the machine to working now.

The very things we may need 2 or 3 years from today to give employment and prevent a depression can only come into existence if the American people know now, and on time, that they will have a legitimate right to expect to be rewarded and keep a substantial part of that reward for accomplishment—if they proceed with their money, genius, and industry to do the things which the people of the United States have always done up to date.

In the June 29, 1946, issue of the London Economist there appeared an article, under the title "The Carrot and the Stick," which presented an interesting analysis of the question of incentive which I have been discussing. The article contains some thought-provoking statements which show how the destruction of incentive through the misuse of taxation in England has brought her to her present dilapidated, unproductive, and humiliated position.

From the knowledge I have gained regarding what makes people work and produce in all countries of the world, I have come to the conclusion that free men work best under an incentive plan which rewards them in proportion to their accomplishment.

In countries where men are not free, they are driven to work by a government which has taken away their freedoms and has the power to make them work up to a certain standard but no further.

In the field of work where men are free to win through the possession of greater ability, more industry, determi-

nation and courage, we find the same principles apply as in the athletic field.

Men and women in our schools and colleges spend considerable time and effort in training for athletic events and accomplishment. They wish to excel. Their desire to excel is based upon their desire to win—sometimes a prize, sometimes a cup, sometimes a medal, and at other times only a certificate of accomplishment.

Mr. President, the point I wish to leave with my colleagues is that if some day we should say to all the athletes in our schools and colleges, "We do not want any of you to excel others; we have decided not to permit anyone to win in the athletic events, because it makes some people feel badly when they lose; we want you to train so that you can run faster than the slowest one in the race, or jump higher than the poorest jumper or throw a discus farther than the poorest discus thrower, or play the games of football and baseball better than the poorest player; but in all these events, before the game is over, we are going to see that no one wins; in the 100-yard dash, we intend to stop everyone at the 95-yard line until the slow runners catch up with the fast ones, and then we want you to step through the tape at the same time"—under such circumstances how many athletes would we have, and how long would the competition which means so much in our school and college life continue?

This imaginary plan for the conduct of athletics is the same thing that has been happening in many countries, and it is the same thing that has been happening in many labor unions. It cannot continue if America is to excel in competition with the rest of the world, and if America is to remain a wise and considerate leader of the world.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to pay my compliments and respects to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], chairman of the Finance Committee, for the clear, concise, and thorough way in which he has placed before the Senate the facts and figures relative to the action which it is proposed that we take in connection with House bill 1, in the amended form in which it has been reported by the Finance Committee. It seems to me that he has covered the situation so clearly that it is unnecessary for me now to discuss the facts and figures which justify our taking the action which the Finance Committee recommends that we take in regard to House bill 1.

I have great respect for the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I feel that his judgment is unusually sound. I am positive that he is not actuated by any political objective in joining others to seek delay upon the decision in connection with H. R. 1, as amended by the Senate Finance Committee. I have great respect for the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I feel that he has done the Nation a great service as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and as the senior member of the minority group of the Senate Finance Committee at the present time.

I agree with both of these distinguished Senators that we must cut Government expenditures. That is vital to our entire future.

I also agree with them that we should make some reasonable payment against the national debt, but I would not start making debt payments of a size which cannot be maintained under an ordinary economy.

It is far better to make a reasonable payment which can be maintained than to make a large payment one year and nothing the next, because that gets one into the habit of thinking that payments do not need to be made.

It is poor policy, and one which the banks and all people in financial institutions dealing with loans do not favor.

Since the President's budget was announced, it has developed clearly to me that the national income payments will be substantially greater than anticipated. We also have the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John W. Snyder, that the Government sees no recession in sight.

If I were to make a prediction on the volume of business and income payments we will have in this country over the next year or two, I would make it on a higher basis than the committee has chosen as the foundation upon which it is recommending that we proceed with the tax cut.

Nothing should stop this country from doing a tremendous business over the next 2 or 3 years. We can by willful, selfish, improvident acts seriously interfere with the operation of our free-enterprise machine, but that can happen any time. And if we are to use that factor in determining the rate of taxation and the time of reducing taxes it will be in the picture the same on June 10 next, on January 1, 1948, or any other date, as it is now.

Of course, we can tear down our whole system and lead ourselves into a situation where the Government will find it necessary to confiscate property.

A choice between going on and functioning harmoniously in the interest of our great system and the welfare of all, on the one hand, and choosing to shut down the Nation by strikes and discord, on the other, is a choice that lies within our own hands.

If the Government will give to the actual working men and women of this country an even distribution of justice, as accorded to all others, and if the Government will recognize that capital must be protected and encouraged in order to go into action and take the ordinary and extraordinary risks of progress, then I make the prediction that we will find the figure of \$170,000,000,000 in national-income payments a most conservative one on which to base tax reductions at this time.

I wish to leave this thought with the Senators and the people of the country: Perhaps the best way to get our Government back into the position it should occupy, if we are to continue our American way which rests upon the free-enterprise system is to encourage our people to work and to say to the Government that they will no longer pay into the Treasury

unnecessary sums which cripple the free-enterprise system just to enable the Government temporarily to continue its course of profligate spending.

Mr. President, extravagant and unrestrained spending by Government and its agencies is not what made the United States of America the leader of the world, and it will not keep her the leader of the world. It is not what will make the United States so strong and powerful in the right that no other nation will ever attack her or attempt to destroy her.

Let us always remember that national solvency is our bulwark of defense. If, through waste and profligacy and failure to organize effectively, so as to live within our income and pay our debts, without crushing the individual spirit, the financial strength of this Nation is dissipated, some of the younger Members of Congress will wake up some day to realize that the only effective defense of a capitalist state against the inroads of socialism and totalitarianism has been destroyed.

Let us remember always that we won two great wars and saved the world for freemen because we were sufficiently strong financially to do the things which were necessary to defeat those who would destroy the rights of freemen.

I have known companies whose directors and management were wasting the stockholders' money through useless and extravagant expenditures. They asked their stockholders to make additional contributions to conduct the business. The stockholders refused, and the public, other than the stockholders, refused to put money into a business so conducted.

When the board of directors and management found that the money was no longer available, they often reverted to a proper conduct of business and cut out all useless expenditures and waste. If they failed to adopt the proper course, the stockholders either got a new set of officers and directors, or the company went on the rocks.

I am not sure but that cutting taxes now may be a blessing in disguise, and may cause us to realize that we cannot have our American free-enterprise system and allow government to continue to waste money in extravagant expenditures, as it has been and still is doing.

I have known many men who have developed extravagant families and have tried to bring them back to live within their income and have met great opposition.

When those men had their income definitely reduced or their salaries cut, they found it necessary to do one of two things: Either define what their family could spend in order to live within their income and thus preserve solvency, or spend themselves into bankruptcy and take advantage of the bankruptcy laws.

We are meeting the same type of opposition every time we endeavor to remain within our income through action by the Congress. Think of the pressure groups. Every time we try to reduce expenditures they come here and say, "Yes, we want Government expenditures cut; we want to get back to operating within our

income, but you cannot do it here, because it hits us." Unfortunately, there is no way for the Government of the United States to go under 77-b of the bankruptcy law.

As I see it, if the United States goes broke and cannot keep faith with its obligations to its people, then we can just say good-bye to our great American system, and we will find ourselves in the slough of despair with other nations of the world who once were great, before their leaders spent the people into bankruptcy or financial troubles so deep that no one could see a way out, without default and reorganization.

God grant that the American people will soon awaken to the fact that we must live within our income, and each of our citizens must accept within the limit of his ability his individual responsibility if we would remain freemen.

Mr. President, I strongly recommend the passage of H. R. 1, as amended by the Senate Finance Committee, and it is my earnest hope that this Nation will not embark upon a campaign of soak the rich and destroy our leaders, but rather that we will come back to the point where we are all willing to pay the price and accept our share of the burden of getting back to the point where Government occupies its proper place as related to its people, and the people assume their responsibility of being the master of their Government.

I ask why anyone should worry about one person having more than another, provided the opportunities of the system are kept fairly open to all.

Let me remind the Senate that God, in his infinite wisdom, did not make all human beings equal.

In the Bible there is the lesson of the man with one talent, the man with two talents, and the man with five talents; and the Creator held each man responsible only for what he possessed.

Alexander Pope said:

Order is heaven's first law; and this confessed,
Some are, and must be, greater than the rest,
More rich, more wise; but who infers from hence,
That such are happier, shocks all common sense.

Condition, circumstance is not the thing;
Bliss is the same in subject or in king.

In our country, we can say bliss is the same in all of our people, regardless of whether they call a small home their castle, or have the trials and tribulations of living in a large home as a castle.

Our objective is to keep our system so working as to give maximum employment on the basis of a decent living wage, in the hope of producing a maximum of happiness and bliss for all our people.

I am certain I am right when I say that if we sit idly by and let the tax burden destroy the leaders of the Nation and the incentive of those who, under fair conditions, will become leaders, then we are guilty of contributing to the injury and destruction of the rest of the people of the Nation.

I have known thousands of working men and women, and most of them have recognized the vital necessity of having great leaders in business who have the

vision and ability to conceive and develop industry in the interest of fuller employment and better working conditions.

Only a very small percentage of the working people I have met have been led into the perverted form of thinking which causes them to reach the unsound conclusion that the man down the line is benefited by destroying the man at the head of the line.

What they want is fair, decent leaders who lead, rather than drive. I have seldom seen a good workman who begrudged a fair leader the success he attained through his leadership.

I wish we would all remember that man can only be a custodian of funds. Our great objective should be to make as many good custodians of funds as is possible. History shows that nearly every man in this country who has produced a great fortune has been a custodian of the funds for only the short period of life in which he possessed them. Most of those men have been inclined to start charities, philanthropies, research foundations, libraries, museums, and so forth, for the benefit of mankind in general.

If time permitted, I could mention, with great credit to most of the families who accumulated those fortunes, the plans they have made for the use of them. For instance, Mr. President, consider the Rockefeller Foundation and the distribution of the Rockefeller fortune. Think of the distribution of the Carnegie fortune. Then remember the cases in which men have been tightfisted and have lacked the important impulse of human interest. But fortunes they accumulated were left to members of their families who have had those human and Christian impulses and have established foundations in the interest of humanity.

Soak the rich means the destruction of the opportunities of the ordinary man to improve himself and raise his standard of living. Soak the rich means the destruction of the opportunities of the poor, as is evidenced by the writings on the walls of history now before our eyes.

Let us stop and listen to the pleas for food, clothing, shelter, and heat that come from a large part of the world, which once was prosperous. Then certainly we must agree that a soak-the-rich policy is a fallacious one.

If we remain unwilling to take cognizance of the results of a soak-the-rich policy, then I imagine the American people must pass through the same bitter experience that the people of the countries of Europe and nations elsewhere have undergone.

Mr. President, soak the rich means the destruction of those who, through genius and energy and hard work, built the foundations upon which our free people in the United States of America have made a better living than has been had by any enslaved people under any government which takes over the freedoms of the people and their pocket-books in return for a bare living.

Think of England following a course of confiscatory taxation and government control and regulation of the lives of its citizens which led to the point where, I am informed, in 1946 there were less than 50 people in the United Kingdom who had an income of \$24,000 a year after taxation, and less than 1,000 people who had an income of \$16,000 a year after taxation.

Remember that Germany fixed taxation after World War I, so that no one could keep an income of more than \$10,000—and thus enslaved her people.

Look at the wreckage that has come from such a course, and let us ask ourselves whether it is better to follow a fair course of taxation and create a few rich people with millions of people comfortably situated, or to pursue the course of other nations and find ourselves in a position where we might need to borrow five or ten billion dollars, but would have no place to go to get it.

Is it not strange, Mr. President, that this capitalistic Nation, the United States of America, has thrived and survived under our profit-incentive system to the point where in all the world it is the only Nation that, with a debt of \$258,000,000,000, still has the heart and the spirit and the material means to succor the stricken people of the world, in the hope of preventing starvation, and teaching them to rise again and accept their full individual responsibility in caring for themselves?

The mainspring that keeps the free competitive enterprise system going is not the original reward received, but that part of the reward which may be kept after taxation.

I have talked with hundreds of young men—able, fine Americans—who are interested in hard work, and who have ability and genius. Nearly every one of them asks the question, "What chance is there for me in the future, if our Government is going to continue to use taxation for the purpose of making a redistribution of earnings and rewarding the slothful and indolent from the fruits produced through the efforts of the diligent, industrious, and thrifty citizens?"

I know there are many people in the United States, perchance in the Congress, who will laugh that off, and will say, "We must provide for all citizens"—never realizing that in providing charity for those who are able to provide for themselves, if they are willing to work, we are doing the people of our Nation as a whole a great injustice.

I know dozens of men who have money or bonds right now and have a good enough standing to be able to get credit, and who would like to embark upon a business; but they see the "Stop—Look—Listen" sign raised by unfair taxation which is not yet cured, and by unfair labor-leader practices not yet cured, and by doubt as to whether our objective in the international field is only to help the world get on its feet, or to enter into international agreements which in leveling off all humanity, will lower our American standards, and thus again break the mainspring of reward for individual initiative and accomplishment.

It is my earnest hope that this great Congress will recognize that millions of people are waiting to hear from the Congress the word that taxation will be used in the future only to produce the revenues which are necessary for the conduct of Government in its proper role of the agent of the people.

Millions of our citizens are waiting to hear the word that although the Government is deeply interested in protecting the fair and just interests of the working men and women of the United States and permitting them to unite to protect their interests by means of unions voluntarily joined, collective bargaining honestly engaged in, and strikes, when necessary, and when called only with due regard to the vital interests and welfare of the people as a whole, nevertheless the Government is determined to become bigger and stronger than any group in our American life, and is prepared to protect the proper interests and welfare of those who make business possible through investment, and that the Government recognizes that a monopoly in the hands of labor leaders is quite as injurious to the welfare of the people as a whole as any other monopoly yet known to man.

Let us ask ourselves whether we would rather have an able man in his private capacity handle the invested capital in business and industry and accept all the responsibilities for his acts so long as he is the owner of such capital or whether we would prefer to have the Government, composed of a group of politicians, with only temporary responsibility, direct the investments of the Nation and through that power, define the benefits and privileges and freedoms of the people.

Mr. President, to my mind, there is only one choice, because I know that the richest man in the country can eat only three meals a day and sometimes not even that. The richest man can sleep in only one bed at a time and often he does not get as peaceful and calm a sleep as the man who carries fewer burdens and cares upon his mind.

As for me, I prefer to take my chances with the American system as it has been for more than 150 years. I prefer to take my chances with the same system that gave me an opportunity to earn a living for myself and my family, without going to the Government for aid. I prefer to take my chances with the system that made America so great that the whole world has had to come to her twice in the last 33 years to ask help in keeping the lamp of freedom burning.

Believing these things, I say that, so far as my mind and judgment run, the time has arrived for the Congress to say to the American people, "We are not going to ask you to work from 1 to 6 days a week for the Government, and we are now going to begin a program which will permit you to enjoy more of the fruits of your own efforts than has been possible under the program you have faced the last few years.

"We, as your representatives in Congress, are going to reduce the expenditures made by Government so as to establish them on a sound and efficient

basis. We are going to eliminate, so far as possible, all unnecessary and profligate spending which is opposed to the preservation of the American system of freemen.

"We expect your aid and help based on your understanding as to what has happened thus far, and as to what must happen if we are to stop the Government from absorbing most of the fruits of production, through the expense that has resulted from having the Government leave its own field and enter fields never dreamed of by our forefathers or by those who built this Nation and developed it to the point where we have, knowingly or unknowingly, become the leaders of the world."

Mr. President, the people's representatives cannot alone accomplish what is in front of them. The people must understand that if we are to get back from where we have gone to where we must be, if we are to preserve ourselves as a free people, then each and every group and each and every American citizen will have to bear willingly some of the burdens incident to this reconversion, and show by voice and action that he or she is willing to pay the price incident to the accomplishment desired.

If we are to retain the American system of freemen, then the people must decide to reharass the Government and force their representatives to curtail the vast expenditures which, if continued, will do more to destroy this Nation and make it communistic and socialistic than all the outside armies of the world.

To sum up my position on House bill 1, as amended by the Senate Finance Committee, I say now is the time for action. I predict that all the factors which some Senators may wish to have present in order to completely justify such tax reduction will never be present.

The Appropriations Committees are making progress. I believe that if we encourage them, they will without question reach their objective. The national income will be considerably higher than the figure used by the President in preparing his budget. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, will show a surplus, rather than a deficit as calculated in the President's budget. A reduction in income tax does not of necessity mean a reduction in Government revenue; but granting that it probably will mean that, it is necessary for the continuance of the life of the machine that produces the profits from which Government revenue must come.

I cannot join the distinguished gentlemen in this Chamber who have predicted that when we fix the tax rate for the coming year, beginning July 1, 1947, it will be the top rate which must carry through 1949, 1950, and 1951. Since when have the conditions governing taxation changed? I have watched the taxing program for a number of years; and whenever a movement to reduce taxes gains momentum, the Government declares an emergency, and, ipso facto, taxes are raised.

I do agree that it will be pathetic if we have to go back to a point where most of the productive people of the United

States are working from 1 to 6 days a week for the Government, thus crushing their hope for future accomplishment. I know of no better way to stop anyone from spending money for unnecessary things, even though those things may be desirable, than to tell him he cannot have the money.

We cannot have our American system that we have enjoyed for 150 years and adopt socialistic and communistic practices.

We cannot have our American system if we are going to break millions of little mainsprings that keep the millions of competent, industrious, and thrifty people in this country going as part of the great national business and industrial machine.

We hear a thousand cries raised against anyone who has tried to cut expenses in an effort to enable us to live within our income.

We hear the cry of national safety.

We hear the cry that certain subsidies which never were given until in recent years must be maintained.

We hear the cry that we must make more and more loans, which should be called gifts, to nations abroad.

In my opinion, the way to have national safety is to keep out of other people's business and to function cooperatively with the world under the United Nations.

The way to have long-time national safety is to stop spending our whole substance in war materials and maintaining an unnecessary armed force at a time when the whole world is too weak to have another war, unless we help to make one.

The way to have national safety is to get ourselves financially strong by paying the national debt so that we shall have the necessary financial strength if and when the United Nations or some other agency fails to keep the peace of the world.

All we have got to do to destroy ourselves is to continue spending excess money for the maintenance of armed forces throughout the world for 10 or 15 years, and go ahead with crushing taxation that destroys the energy and initiative of our people. We then shall find ourselves right where all the other nations of the world who have followed these processes find themselves today—in the junk heap or so close to it that even we are worried about them.

I had thought in the beginning that we must have an agreement between the House and the Senate on the budget ceiling, but certainly when the House fixes a budget reduction of \$6,000,000,000 and the Senate fixes a budget reduction of \$4,500,000,000, and we take the lower of the two, from my point of view the argument to defer taxes on that basis is of no value.

I agree that I would like to see all the budget reductions accomplished, but let us remember that there is leeway in the picture on account of the increased national income payments, and, also, in my opinion, the budget reduction recommended by the Senate will be accomplished.

It will be accomplished more readily and more definitely if we deal fairly with the people on their income-tax payments so that they may know the benefits will begin accruing to them as of July 1, 1947.

Mr. President, it is my considered opinion and judgment that H. R. 1, as amended by the Senate Finance Committee, is a proper step for the people's representatives to take at the present time in the interest of the people. I say "proper step" because it is a step toward correcting the evil of our having our citizens work more of their time for the Government than they do for themselves and their families.

There are dozens and dozens of injustices in our present tax law, and that whole subject must be properly analyzed and considered in the light of hearings to be held in the interest of permitting the people to express before their representatives their own opinions as to the course future taxation should follow.

No man knows the future of the world, but it is my earnest hope that we will take this action in recognition of the fact that we have a solemn duty to the people to lower taxation; that we have a solemn duty to the people to get rid of useless, unnecessary, and profligate expenditures by Government; and that the people have a right to look to us at this time to bring Government back from where it has gone since the last two world wars, and reharass their Government so that the people may be its masters rather than its slaves.

I shall vote for H. R. 1 as it is in the hope of making some contribution toward correcting other tax evils as rapidly as it is possible to consider the subject fairly in the interest of all.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to enable me to present a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall, but I fear that I shall have a reservation.

Mr. WHITE. I think there will be no offense in what I suggest. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may be permitted to sit this afternoon with that committee during the session of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the request is granted, I must again call attention to the fact that the slim attendance now upon the floor of the Senate is due solely to the fact that requests such as the majority leader has just now made have been made on behalf of numerous committees. At this moment the Committee on Appropriations has been called to assemble to consider the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. I am a member of that committee and there are several statements I should make to the committee upon that bill, but I feel that, in justice to myself, I should be on the floor of the Senate to make some observations on the pending measure, the most important of all bills.

Requests of the kind just made should not be granted while a measure of this tremendous importance, proposing a reduction in taxes while our national debt is at the highest pinnacle ever reached, is pending, but when these important bills are under discussion, the Republicans, secure in the majority which they have, knowing that the votes will be cast regardless of what the arguments may be or what reason and logic may be, are quite willing to have the Chamber emptied into the committee rooms, where the appropriation bills are being rushed through to make the showing upon which the reduction of taxes will be based.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator does not object.

Mr. WHITE. Has the Senator objected to my request?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Maine is granted.

TAX REDUCTION NOW IS RECKLESS PROPOSAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion the majority party, in bringing in the tax bill before us, have brought in one of the most reckless legislative proposals ever made in the history of the Government of the United States. If, at a time when our national debt approximates \$260,000,000,000, a figure which no one can imagine, they are willing to cut taxes before they know what our obligations will be, before they know whether or not it will be possible to raise the revenue needed to operate the Government, it seems to me that is a policy of such obvious folly that no serious person could undertake to support it for a moment.

Yet it is supported. Men of intelligence, of ability, yes, of patriotism, come here and say, upon the basis of guesses—and they acknowledge that all they can offer is guesses—that the United States may run the risk of so reducing its revenue that it will be unable to carry on the necessary functions of government, and unable to reduce the national debt.

SECRETARY MELLON FOR DEBT REDUCTION

I have remembered, during the pendency of this measure, that long before I became a Member of the Senate, when I was practicing law out in Cheyenne, Wyo., during the administrations of Harding and Coolidge, the Secretary of the Treasury at that time, Andrew W. Mellon, seemed to be of the opinion that surplus Federal revenues should be used for reduction of the debt, rather than for reduction of taxes. So last Saturday I undertook to find out what Mr. Mellon had said, and I have here several very interesting quotations from that great Republican Secretary of the Treasury. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who sits beside me, has remarked sotto voce that Mr. Mellon was generally termed by the Republicans of that time as "the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton."

What made him great, Mr. President? Was it because he believed that debt reduction was the prime consideration of sound finance, or was it because he was willing recklessly to cut the taxes without reducing the debt?

In 1924 Mr. Mellon published a book entitled "Taxation: The People's Business." On page 30 of that book I find an interesting paragraph I wish to read, and I ask that the members of the majority who are present here this afternoon pay some attention to the words of Andrew Mellon, if not to the exhortations of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], whose motion we are debating.

Said Mr. Mellon:

Many people cling to the old policy that debt retirement is bad for business, being the reverse of inflated conditions accompanying vast borrowings. They hold that new borrowings with reduced taxes are preferable to higher taxes with reduced debts. But a moment's reflection will convince anyone—

I do not suppose the Secretary of the Treasury in the Harding-Coolidge administrations was including in that word the gentlemen of the majority who now constitute the ruling power in the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. In those days they used to listen to Mellon. In these days they want to cut a melon. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has produced the word to represent the conditions that exist. We are cutting a melon before the melon is grown.

Secretary Mellon proceeded:

A moment's reflection will convince anyone that prosperity cannot come from continued plunging into debt. The present condition of Germany is the best proof of the dangers of inflation and financial pyramiding. As a matter of fact, orderly debt retirement out of surplus revenues is better calculated to restore prosperity, for the debt is retired by taxes paid in for the purpose and the money retained for the payment of such taxes is saved from being dissipated in useless expenditure.

TO SAVE MONEY, REDUCE THE DEBT

Mr. President, it would be difficult to condense in a shorter paragraph the correct philosophy which ought to be followed by the Congress at this moment. Every possible economy in the expenditure of the public funds ought to be adopted; but, before undertaking to reduce our revenue, we should undertake first to apply every possible dollar of surplus upon the reduction of the national debt. Then, and only then, should we begin to think of cutting the melon, as the Senator from Maryland has so well said.

The Republican Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon, from whose book I have quoted, took that position in several instances. In his annual report for 1924 he had this to say:

Sound Government finance, including a rigid debt-paying policy, is absolutely indispensable to the best interests of business and private finance.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that those businessmen, if any there be, who are supporting the pending proposal to reduce taxes, before we know what our expenditures must be, are literally cutting their own financial throats. At the very moment when the forces of totalitarianism are spreading all over the world the argument that capitalism is too greedy to preserve itself, there are those who are so short-sighted that they are willing to endanger the solvency of the United States by reducing revenue before they know they can have a balanced budget. After 18 years, Mr. President, we stand within scarcely more than 30 days of the first balanced budget in all that time; and the majority not only proposes to prevent the balancing of the budget by reducing revenues, but it is unwilling even to postpone the consideration of the bill until the 10th of June, when it will be possible for the Senate to have a better idea of what the appropriation bills will be.

Private credit—

Said Mr. Mellon—

cannot continue to flourish if the public credit is in a state of chaos. Therefore the debt-paying program has been the only consistent policy to follow. The necessity for such a policy is obvious when it is realized that this country came out of the war with a debt at its peak in 1919 equal approximately to the total expenditures of the government during its entire existence prior to 1917.

O Mr. President, if Secretary of the Treasury Mellon could so characterize the puny debt of \$26,000,000,000, in 1919, what would he say now if he had in contemplation the towering debt of \$260,000,000,000? Would he be one to urge the reduction of taxes rather than the reduction of the debt? Let me go on reading from the Secretary:

The debt per capita has risen from \$12 at the beginning of the war to about \$250 at the middle of 1919.

What is the per capita debt now? It is over \$2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States—and yet we are asked to temporize with a condition of that kind. Going on with the views of Mr. Mellon:

Interest alone on this debt has been about a quarter of a billion dollars more each year since 1920 than the total Government expenditures during the fiscal year 1916, the last prewar year.

Every single one of these statements made by Secretary Mellon, in alarm, in amazement, is now absolutely dwarfed by the statements which can be made at this moment about the magnitude of the debt and the cost of carrying it. Let no one forget that this huge national debt of almost \$260,000,000,000 is not a debt that was incurred by "Government spending." It was the debt that was incurred by unanimous action of the Congress of the United States, Democrats and Republicans voting together to win the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall ask the Senator if I may have a few more moments.

Mr. GEORGE. I will gladly yield 5 or 10 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it were desirable that we should pay high taxes during the war, in order to pay for it, then it is equally desirable to urge payment of the debt now, for the debt we now carry no less than the taxes we have already contributed constitutes payment for the war.

Let me return to the advice of Secretary Mellon:

THE NATIONAL DEBT IS A MORTGAGE ON THE NATIONAL WEALTH

The nation which does not follow a policy of paying its debts—

I commend this to the attention of all Senators—

The nation which does not follow a policy of paying its debts, but allows them to accumulate, may be compared to an individual who follows a similar course. It is a sign of debility and denotes the absence of essential vigor and foresight. The public debt is a mortgage or lien upon national wealth, and unless the country pursues a policy of paying off this mortgage, it is bound to become more and more burdensome as time goes on. Debt reduction, in fact, is the best method of bringing about tax reduction. Aside from gradually refunding at lower rates of interest, it is the only method of reducing the heavy annual interest charges.

Secretary Mellon was alarmed at the thought of interest charges running about \$250,000,000 a year. Now, we have interest charges running at the rate of \$5,000,000,000 a year; which is more than the entire cost of Congress, of the White House, of the Library of Congress, all the Federal courts, and most of the civil functions of the Government. But, Mr. President, do we understand that the whole capitalistic system stands now upon the solvency of the United States of America? Unless we preserve the solvency of this Government, capitalism will perish from the earth. I undertake to show that all business and industry relies now upon a fiscal policy that will place debt retirement first.

As to the outstanding debt, the actual figure as of March 31, 1947, according to the report which I requested from the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, was \$256,000,000,000. Of this amount, \$65,000,000,000 was held by individuals, including partnerships and personal trusts. Of this latter amount some \$50,000,000,000 was represented by E, F, and G bonds. Every one of those bonds is a "demand payment" upon the Treasury of the United States. Everyone of those bonds may be presented at any time and payment must be made at the face value. The time will come, as the result of the policy which the majority is initiating here, when legislation will be introduced in the Congress of the United States to permit those bonds to be sold at a discount, and then the veterans of World War II will be forced to lose on their investment, as did the veterans of World

War I, when they sold their bonds as low as 80 cents on the dollar.

Insurance companies hold \$25,000,000,000 of these outstanding bonds. Mr. President, the 36 largest legal reserve life insurance companies in America own more than 80 percent of all the assets of all life insurance companies, and they have reported that 47 percent of their assets are invested in Government bonds. I say, Mr. President, every life insurance policy in America rests upon the solvency of United States bonds. You tamper with the solvency of these bonds and you tamper with every life insurance policy that is outstanding.

Corporations and other associations have \$23,000,000,000 of Government bonds. State and local governments have six and one-half billion dollars of Government bonds, and Federal agencies and trust funds have thirty-one and one-half billion dollars of Government bonds.

Let us now look at the picture with respect to bank holdings. Commercial banks own seventy and one-half billion dollars of Government bonds. Every person who has any knowledge at all about finance knows that these bonds held by commercial banks are the creators of money, they are the creators of demand, they are the bases of inflation, and if there is any one thing that the Government should do it is to concentrate all its authority and all its efforts upon the payment as rapidly as possible of these bonds held by commercial banks and trust companies. Other bonds can be more safely carried, but in the interest of reducing the cost of living, the holdings of commercial banks should be reduced.

The Federal Reserve banks own twenty-two and one-half billion dollars of Government bonds.

In other words, there is a total of \$93,000,000,000 which is so held that it constitutes a constant threat of inflation.

Mr. President, if we add together the bonds held by the commercial banks, by the mutual savings banks, by the Federal Reserve banks, and by the insurance companies, we find that 57½ percent of all the bonds the United States has issued are being held by such institutions. Yet here it is lightly said, "Forget the bonds. Let that matter pass. We will reduce the taxes."

TAX BILL FAVORS VERY WEALTHY

Mr. President, I undertake to say that the tax reduction which is proposed here is a reduction which is designed to lower the tax burden on the very wealthy at the expense of those at the bottom of the economic scale. I have before me a table based upon the table placed in the Record the other day by the chairman of the Finance Committee in which he showed the amount of spendable income for married persons with no dependents in the various income groups, and I have added two columns, one showing the amount of money saved for every \$1,000 of income, and the other the percentage of spendable income which is saved by this bill. I ask unanimous con-

sent that the table may be printed in the Record without my reading it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

[Computed from table on p. 5589, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 21, 1947]

MARRIED PERSONS—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of spendable income saved	Saved per \$1,000 of spendable income	Percent of spendable income saved
\$1,000	0	0	0
\$1,200	\$11.40	\$9.50	.95
\$1,500	28.50	19.00	1.90
\$1,800	45.60	25.36	2.52
\$2,000	57.00	28.50	2.85
\$2,500	57.00	22.80	2.28
\$3,000	76.00	25.33	2.54
\$4,000	117.80	29.45	2.94
\$5,000	159.00	31.80	3.19
\$6,000	209.00	34.83	3.49
\$7,000	258.40	36.91	3.69
\$8,000	318.40	39.80	3.94
\$9,000	372.40	41.37	4.14
\$10,000	437.00	43.70	4.37
\$11,000	501.60	45.60	4.56
\$12,000	573.80	47.81	4.78
\$13,000	646.00	49.61	4.97
\$14,000	727.70	51.97	5.20
\$15,000	809.40	53.93	5.40
\$20,000	1,278.70	63.93	6.40
\$25,000	1,816.00	72.64	7.27
\$30,000	2,394.00	79.80	7.98
\$40,000	3,619.50	90.48	9.05
\$50,000	4,959.00	99.18	9.92
\$60,000	6,378.00	106.50	10.65
\$70,000	7,854.00	112.23	11.22
\$80,000	9,387.50	117.34	11.73
\$90,000	10,908.65	117.87	11.79
\$100,000	11,844.12	118.44	11.85
\$150,000	18,182.52	121.21	12.13
\$200,000	24,593.60	122.46	12.29
\$250,000	31,075.92	124.30	12.43
\$300,000	37,559.67	125.19	12.52
\$400,000	46,791.60	116.97	11.69
\$500,000	55,891.00	111.78	11.18
\$750,000	78,641.00	104.85	10.49
\$1,000,000	101,391.00	101.39	10.14
\$2,000,000	192,391.00	91.19	9.62
\$5,000,000	450,000.00	90.00	8.55

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to call the attention of Senators who are listening to this talk that on the first thousand dollars of income the little people of the land are given a saving of \$9.50. The \$10,000 income man receives, not a saving of \$9.50 per thousand dollars, but of \$43.50 per thousand dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield me further time?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If we go to the \$15,000 a year income, we find that the saving per thousand dollars under the pending tax bill is upped again to \$53.93. When we come to \$100,000 income per year, the saving under the pending bill is \$118.44 per thousand dollars of income.

Mr. President, why should we undertake to pass a tax bill which will save \$118 per thousand dollars for the income recipient in the \$100,000 bracket and give only \$9.50 per thousand to the little fellow at the bottom of the scale?

I now turn to page 37 of the report filed by the Finance Committee, and find this very interesting information. The total number of taxpayers in the United States receiving less than \$5,000 a year is

47,723,103. They constitute 96.03 percent of all the taxpayers in the United States.

The taxpayers who are receiving over \$5,000 a year number 1,948,060. They constitute 3.92 percent of all the taxpayers. To this 3.92 percent to this minority, 1,948,060 high-income recipients, out of a total of 49,671,163 taxpayers, the Finance Committee bill makes a gift of 36 percent of all of the reduction which is granted. Less than 4 percent of the taxpayers get 36 percent of the benefit.

Mr. President, if we were to take the little group which receives between \$4,000 and \$5,000 a year, we find, according to the report of the Finance Committee, that they constitute 1,909,500 persons, almost the same number as those in all the brackets from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and over a year, those above the \$5,000 line of demarkation.

To the 1,948,000 above \$5,000 a year it is proposed that there shall be a tax reduction of 36 percent. To the 1,909,000 receiving between \$4,000 and \$5,000 a year it is proposed that there shall be a tax reduction of only 6.03 percent.

Are we speaking of equality of obligation under the law? Are we speaking of equality of benefits? Are we speaking of a solvent government when we undertake to say, as we shall say if we vote against the motion of the Senator from Georgia, that it is so important to grant these reductions of taxes to those who are receiving more than \$5,000 a year that we shall not be willing to wait until the 10th of June to find out how much the Government of the United States will have to spend to maintain the capitalistic system?

I have no hesitation in saying that if we pass this bill we shall be doing more to jeopardize the private economy than anything Hitler and Mussolini ever did or Stalin even thought of doing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for 10 minutes?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate has never laid down any written rule regarding pairs upon legislation to be voted upon in this body. It is and always has been a personal matter between individual Senators. Most of the past records of the United States Senate clearly indicate that the pairing of Senators upon important measures has been agreed upon through senatorial courtesy which held high the tradition and dignity of what many of us like to call the greatest deliberative body in the world. In the old days we found Senators exercising with charity and tolerance their rights of pairing. That was particularly true when a Senator was ill or when there was serious illness in his family.

Let me turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1920, and enlighten Members of the present-day Senate as to what was done at that time in connection with one of the most important votes that any Senator had cast in this body up to that time.

The late distinguished Senator Lodge of Massachusetts said:

Mr. President, I had intended when I called up the treaty this morning to say a word in regard to pairs. On a question of such great moment as the Treaty of Peace I think no one can wish that it should turn on any loss of votes because of the absence of Senators or because of any juggling of pairs.

Think of it, Mr. President. In 1920 the United States Senate was discussing the treaty of peace, one of the greatest issues that had ever been before this body in the experience of any Senator who was serving at that time.

Senator Lodge continued:

I think that we should take the same course that was adopted with reference to the suffrage amendment—

Another tremendous issue before the United States Senate and the country—when the Senate, with the traditional character for which it was noted, agreed at that time not to juggle pairs and to have an honest expression of Senators in the event that any Senator should be absent because of personal illness or because there was illness in his family.

I think that we should take the same course that was adopted with reference to the suffrage amendment, when there was an understanding on both sides that a pair should be arranged for any Senator who was absent on account of personal illness or on account of illness or death in his family. I merely mention this now, because I think the whips on both sides who are entrusted with this matter should see to it that some such arrangement is made. I think that is only fair and proper.

Those words were spoken by the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts.

I read further from the RECORD of that date:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question. Of course, the Senator means equal pairs upon the question of the adoption of reservations and amendments?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, and double pairs upon the question of ratification.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When it comes to the final question of ratification pairs would be arranged on a basis of 2 to 1.

Mr. LODGE. They would be arranged upon a basis of 2 to 1, of course. That is the understanding I wish to have. I merely mention it now, because I think it is important that that should be understood. None of us wish to reach a decision of this question by any accident.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest that the Senator ask unanimous consent to the effect he has indicated.

Mr. LODGE. Pairs are outside the rules, and I do not think I have any right to ask unanimous consent. I think all I can do is to state the understanding which I hope will be arrived at.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have sent word to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hitchcock], and I expect him here in a moment. If the Senator cares to present the matter again, I suggest that he do so when the Senator from Nebraska returns.

Mr. LODGE. Pairs are wholly outside the rules, as I have stated. Pairing is a matter between individual Senators.

Mr. KING. I appreciate that fact, but I should be glad to see some satisfactory arrangement made.

Mr. LODGE. I have no doubt the matter will be arranged as it was in the case of the suffrage amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have no doubt any such arrangement will be carried out on this side.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wanted to make the suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am sure we will be glad to see that the final action represents the thought of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Here we have an interesting and cordial colloquy between Republicans and Democrats, which can well be placed in the category of true statesmanship when it comes to voting upon questions such as we have before the Senate today. It demonstrates the outstanding character and bigness of Senators in those days upon a question of human relationships.

Mr. President, in the early days of my experience in the Senate an incident occurred which struck me forcibly. I had been a Member of the Senate for approximately 12 months, when a very close friend of mine passed away in Illinois. We were debating the Hatch bill. It will be recalled that at one time we almost defeated it, by a vote of 44 to 46. I was against the Hatch bill at that time, and still am, so far as that is concerned. But I did not wish to leave, after participating actively in the debate, unless I could obtain a live pair.

From whom do Senators think I obtained that pair? From the late distinguished, lovable Charles McNary, one of the greatest leaders ever to serve in the Senate. I went to Senator McNary and said, "Senator, a close friend of mine has suddenly passed away. I should like to obtain a live pair. I do not want to run out on my colleagues, because I have been very active in this debate." Senator McNary said to me, "Scott, your place is at the side of your dead friend in Illinois. You go and attend the funeral, and I will give you a live pair."

Mr. President, that incident endeared me forever to Charles McNary. It demonstrated character and bigness, so necessary for sound statesmanship. It was a senatorial courtesy that I shall never forget. Such courtesy and chivalry should again find a place in the Senate.

Mr. President, today there are two distinguished Senators who sit on this side of the aisle who are ill. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] was compelled by doctor's orders to go to Arizona for the benefit of his health. Mr. President, the minority are entirely helpless in getting a pair from some Member on the other side of the aisle for that outstanding man, a man who is sick. We are told, "Yes; we will pair with you providing the leadership releases us."

I went to the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] in connection with the matter. I knew that he was a close friend of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. I said to him, "Will you pair with the Senator from Louisiana on this motion?" He replied, "I should be glad to pair with him, because he is one of the finest men in the Senate; but you will have to see the whip, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. If he will

release me, I will pair with the Senator from Louisiana."

There is another Senator on this side of the aisle who is ill, that great leader from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], who has served longer in the Senate than any living man. He is now in the hospital, stricken only day before yesterday. He does not want to leave the hospital in his present condition. His doctors oppose his leaving. One would believe that under such dire circumstances we might get a pair for him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. May I have two additional minutes?

Mr. GEORGE. My time is getting a little short. I will yield one additional minute.

Mr. LUCAS. There is not a chance. They will not recognize the fact that this man, ill as he is, is entitled to a pair by all decency and courtesy, so far as the unwritten rules of the Senate are concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator recall any time during the period when we were in the emergency when any such attitude was taken on this side toward requests for a pair on the part of any Senator on the other side?

Mr. LUCAS. I have never known of it. I made inquiry today on that very point in order to ascertain whether we had taken the same position, but I could find no such position as that which is now being taken by the majority upon practically every major or minor question which arises. Here is a matter of postponement of a measure for some 20 days, and we cannot get a pair in connection with it. But the late Senator Lodge was willing to give pairs when the Treaty of Versailles was being considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. To whom do the Senators in charge of the floor yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, regarding the question of pairs, I have been here for a good many years and I have never seen any acknowledged plan or rule regarding pairs. I should say that today if a sufficient number of Republicans to change the situation were too ill to attend the Senate, we could not get a pair from the Democrats for love or money. They have never given us pairs under those circumstances, and they never will. The Senator goes back to 1920 in order to find an instance in which the question has ever before been raised.

There is before the Senate a question which is essentially and in effect a question of budgeting revenue. It is a question of degree. The actual question, so far as we can determine it is, What will be the receipts of the Government and what will be its expenditures in the fiscal

year beginning the 1st of July and running until July 1, 1948?

The making of a budget is always an uncertain process, because no one can predict ahead for 18 months. We have to take the best figures we can obtain; we have to take figures from the actuaries; we have to make various assumptions. We have always done that, every year. The Democrats are greatly concerned that in some way we are estimating figures which do not exist and, therefore, the budget which we in effect are presenting here may possibly not be balanced.

Mr. President, for 15 years the Democrats have failed to balance the budget in any year. Not only that, but I do not remember a time when they ever presented a balanced budget to the Congress of the United States. I do not remember a time when they ever provided sufficient taxes to meet the expenditures which they contemplated. Certainly we have not had in 15 years a balanced budget, and we have always had some difficulty in estimating, which we have at the present time and always will have. We have made estimates, and the figures are approximately these: The estimated receipts on which our budget is based are \$41,400,000,000. Those estimates were made by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, because the Treasury refuses to make any estimate more recent than the one of 8 months ago when conditions were very different. Those figures are based on conservative estimates. They are estimating a national income of \$6,000,000,000 less than the rate at which we are now operating, so they allow for the tapering off of sales and activity. There may be, perhaps, an extraordinary condition if we continue going at the same rate as today. The budget receipts represent \$42,800,000,000. We will assume the amount to be \$41,400,000,000. The estimate of expenses is \$37,500,000,000, or approximately \$4,000,000,000 less than the estimated receipts, without any budget cuts whatsoever. If we cut the budget \$4,500,000,000, as Senators say they wish to do, we will have a total expense of \$33,000,000,000 and will have a surplus of \$8,500,000,000.

What does the bill propose to do? It proposes to take \$3,200,000,000 of that sum and apply it to the reduction of taxes. It proposes, under those circumstances, that we leave more than \$5,000,000,000 for contingencies and for application to the public debt.

It is suggested that those figures may not be correct; that we may not get \$41,400,000,000. I have already stated that we have allowed for a considerable recession. Much of the revenue is already on the books. The corporation taxes for this year and a large part of the corporation taxes for next year, reflecting the income for the previous year, are already set and cannot be reduced. Even if we should have a depression, there is usually a very slow recession; and in order to make any substantial difference in the figures the national income would have to go down to approximately \$150,000,000,000. We would have to have a sudden

and extreme depression in order to prevent the realization of the income figures which have been placed before the Senate. Of course, a budget may always be upset in any year if there is a sudden and severe depression. But the administration certainly does not expect that. It was testified that they look forward to no depression of any kind. They testified that in their opinion there would not even be a recession. Certainly we are justified in making that assumption, based upon receipts. Even if we fall short, Mr. President, a billion dollars in receipts and reach a total of \$4,500,000,000, we still can make this tax reduction and have a surplus of over \$3,000,000,000 to apply on the public debt.

Those, roughly speaking, are the figures.

Mr. President, it seems to me very clear that tax reduction is a necessary end in itself, to bring about a stable economy in the United States and to enable us to maintain an economic activity which means employment and full prosperity. Think of the burden of taxation. It is made up of approximately \$40,000,000,000 of taxes by the Federal Government and approximately \$10,000,000,000 of State and local taxes; a total of approximately \$50,000,000,000, bearing down on the people of the United States and discouraging and stifling the economy of the United States. It does not particularly affect us when things are on the way up; but the moment they start down we feel the crushing burden which is imposed. It is about 30 percent of the national income. That means that on the average, directly and indirectly, we are paying taxes in such an amount that we work 3 days out of every 10 for the United States Government and 7 days for ourselves. I do not know how high this tax burden can go and still permit a free economy to be maintained such as that upon which we rely in the United States.

Obviously, Mr. President, taxation cannot amount to 100 percent of the national income, or we shall have no free economy left. One hundred percent taxation means the complete socialization of all the activities of the Nation. There is a point at which taxation becomes so high that we can no longer prevent it from destroying our present economic system. A burden of taxation as heavy as 30 percent of the national income discourages every person and every industry, and, sooner or later, industries are unable to do what they are supposed to do, and so the Government has to take them over. We almost reached that point in the case of the railroads during the war and during the depression.

Mr. President, once the Government takes over industries, it has to distribute the burden among the people. The very tax burden itself is a discouragement to the continuation of the free-enterprise system, and a heavy tax burden gradually forces the Government into a greater and greater degree of socialization, until finally complete socialization is reached. If I wanted to socialize the United States, I think the easiest way to do it would be

gradually to increase Government activities and taxation until the Government itself was operating all the industries and all the affairs of the Nation. But if that process were followed indefinitely, with a constant increase in taxation, finally the Government itself could not survive. I do not know where that point is. Perhaps it is when taxation reaches 50 percent of the national income. But I say that when taxation reaches 30 percent of the national income, we are reaching a dangerous point, and we should be sincerely and seriously concerned with the reduction of the taxes paid by the people of the United States, who now have a tax burden of \$40,000,000,000 a year as apparently a permanent burden on the economy we are trying to maintain.

Furthermore, Mr. President, such a tax burden is a crushing load on the individuals in the lower-income groups. As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] pointed out, there are approximately 1,000,000 persons in the United States who have an income of less than \$1,000 a year. Nevertheless, the tax burdens are heavy on those who have small incomes. For example, a school teacher who receives \$1,000 a year must pay an income tax of \$90. It certainly is difficult enough to live on \$1,000 a year under present circumstances in the United States, even without having to pay any tax. A married couple with an income of \$1,500 must pay \$90 in income taxes. A single woman with an income of \$1,500 must pay an income tax of \$190. A married couple with two children, and having an income of \$3,000, must pay an income tax of \$190. A married couple with no dependents, and having a gross income of \$5,000, must pay almost \$800 in income taxes. Certainly taxation at those rates constitutes a tremendously severe burden on the people at the bottom of the income scale.

Moreover, Mr. President, to a certain extent the taxpayers bear the burden, and to a certain extent they do not bear it. To a certain extent, employers, seeing how extremely difficult it is for persons in the lower income groups to live on their net incomes, proceed to increase wages and salaries, in order to take care of that problem, and the result is an increase in the costs of manufacturing and other enterprises. Such increased costs bring about increased prices, and increased prices lead to inflation. In other words, we pay, by inflation, for the increases in wages and salaries which sooner or later result from increased taxes. High taxes are all very well for a while, but soon inflation comes, for inflation has always been the escape from overdrastic taxation. So, in effect, we are merely inflating the economy and collecting taxes from inflated incomes.

In the second place, Mr. President, in such circumstances the burden on the middle-income groups is so great that in the case of individual businessmen or corporation executives, or even writers and creative artists, their income after they have worked the first 6 months of a tax year is about all the income they are interested in, for whatever they earn,

in addition, during the remainder of the year, is largely taken by the Government in the form of income taxes. The result is that they are not interested in doing any more work and in making any more income in that year because the Government will take anywhere from 60 percent to 85 percent of whatever else they may earn.

An additional result is that people refuse to invest money in risk enterprises; for when income taxes are so high investors take the position that it is much better for them to receive from 1 percent to 1½ percent on tax-exempt municipal bonds, rather than to invest their money in new enterprises in which their chances of receiving an income may be only 50-50. So they are not willing to invest their funds in such enterprises, because they know that if they gain as a result of investing their money in risk enterprises the Government will take the greater proportion of what they gain, but if they lose they will lose their own money. So they find that it is better for them to accept a low income from municipal bonds or similar securities, rather than to attempt to make money by investing in new enterprises. However, all of us realize that the establishment of new enterprises is necessary to the maintenance of our economy; it is necessary if we are to maintain full employment in view of the constantly improved techniques and labor-saving devices. Under present-day standards and techniques it is essential that new enterprises, with their additional hundreds of thousands of employees, be continually established. Obviously it is necessary that the investment of money in them be encouraged. Of course, it is easy enough to persuade investors to invest their money in bonds; but it is essential that investors be persuaded to invest their money in risk enterprises. However, under the present tax system, that is not done. So, Mr. President, I say that the reduction of taxes is a desirable end in itself and is essential if we are to maintain the prosperity of the United States and the full employment in which we are interested. No one could be more concerned about that than I am.

I am somewhat amused to hear the Democrats protest about the necessity of reducing the national debt. The national debt was \$22,000,000,000 when the Democrats came into office, and now that they have been in office it is \$260,000,000,000. The Democrats have never before shown any concern about the size of the national debt or about increasing the national debt, but now they are greatly concerned about decreasing the national debt this year. I myself think I would accept a \$2,000,000,000-a-year reduction in the national debt, and I would be willing to have in the budget an item for debt reduction in that amount. Nevertheless, we must realize that when \$2,000,000,000 is taken from the people's incomes and is used to reduce the national debt, the purchasing power of the people is reduced to that extent. In that way we are already reducing the purchasing power by a considerable sum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a table which shows that the taxes which are collected for the unemployment trust fund and for the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance fund, the veterans' life insurance funds, and the other funds of that nature now amount to \$5,587,298,291 altogether, whereas the expenditures from those funds amount to only \$2,780,473,038, leaving net accumulations of \$2,806,825,253 in the trust accounts. The result is that even when the budget is balanced, approximately \$2,800,000,000 is taken from the people's savings and is put away, not returned to them, and thus their purchasing power is reduced to that extent.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Trust account receipts and expenditures

RECEIPTS	
Unemployment trust fund:	1948
Deposits by States.....	\$1,124,000,000
Deposits by Railroad Retirement Board.....	280,300,000
Transfers from general and special accounts.....	9,373,778
Federal old-age and survivors' insurance:	
Net appropriation from general accounts.....	1,987,100,000
Interest on investments.....	190,300,000
Veterans' life-insurance funds:	
Premiums and other receipts.....	639,520,000
Transfers from general fund.....	53,302,000
Federal employees' retirement funds:	
Deductions from salaries, etc.....	289,891,351
Transfers from general accounts.....	246,445,000
Railroad retirement account:	
Interest on investments.....	37,000,000
Transfers from general accounts.....	481,219,000
Other trust accounts:	
Transfers from general accounts.....	8,775,000
Miscellaneous receipts.....	240,072,162
Total receipts, trust accounts.....	5,587,298,291

EXPENDITURES	
Unemployment trust fund.....	749,000,000
Federal old-age and survivors' fund.....	543,000,000
Veterans' life-insurance funds.....	358,950,088
Federal employees' retirement funds.....	167,610,349
Railroad retirement account.....	270,000,000
Other trust accounts.....	410,812,601
Special deposit accounts:	
Government corporations.....	247,000,000
Other.....	250,000,000
Sales and redemptions of obligations of Government corporations in the market.....	1215,900,000
	2,780,473,038

Net accumulations in trust accounts..... 2,806,825,253

¹ Excess of redemptions; deduct.

Source: Budget, table 4, p. A7.

Mr. TAFT. So, Mr. President, when we reduce the national debt \$2,000,000,000, we reduce the actual purchasing power of the people a corresponding amount. I think we should reduce the debt; but if we reduce it by too large a sum at one time, we shall reduce the purchasing power of the people to such an extent as to actually damage the economy and actually cut down the ability of the people to purchase.

Mr. President, the President said in his economic report:

Maximum production and employment this year would yield a substantial increase in the available supply of consumers' goods and services, especially in the area of durable goods. This requires higher real purchasing power to take the goods off the market. If price and wage adjustments are not made, and made soon enough, there is danger that consuming buying will falter.

Certainly, Mr. President, if we are going to apply to the national debt a surplus of \$8,000,000,000, we shall cut down purchasing power to a tremendous extent. At the moment, purchasing power is perhaps still on the increase, but it shows signs of having reached a peak. If we take that much purchasing power away from the people during the next 12 months, we may easily contribute to turning the present situation into a recession and a depression. It is obvious that we cannot safely reduce the national debt too rapidly.

The actual existence of a national debt is not necessarily a threat to the people of the United States. The present debt involves an interest charge of approximately \$5,000,000,000 a year. If we pay off \$10,000,000,000 of the debt, we reduce the expenditures for interest on the debt by approximately \$200,000,000, on the basis of a 2 percent interest charge. Of course, it is important to keep reducing the national debt, so that Government credit may be good and there may be a constant movement toward a lower total interest charge on the national debt. But the very existence of the national debt does not threaten the security of the United States, and I do not think anyone in the United States really thinks so today. Of course, we want to reduce the debt, but if at the moment I had my choice between the two, I would prefer tax reduction to debt reduction. As a matter of fact, we are in the fortunate situation that we can have both during the coming year.

Mr. President, it is said that we have not yet cut expenses, that we do not know what the expenses will be. I would only say, in reply, that the Budget of the United States is an extremely complicated document, made up not only of the department appropriations, about which we know, but it is made up of all sorts of Government corporation accounts and cross accounts, with a net figure between the expenditures and receipts, but it is a figure which has many tricks in it.

Let us take, for instance, the Government corporation figures, \$440,000,000 for RFC, purchase of mortgages on veterans' homes, as an expenditure of the budget. The mortgages are perfectly good mortgages. The RFC never has

counted purchase of mortgages as an expenditure. I do not know why they are in this budget. There is no doubt some reason, some statutory requirement. But there is \$440,000,000 of possible savings which can be taken out, and the arguments as to what the expenditures of the Government are going to be will go on for months after the Congress adjourns. We will not know any more about them 30 days from now than we know now. We can tell the trend, and that is all. So far as we can tell from the trend, and figuring the appropriation bills which have passed and are now pending in the Congress, we are accomplishing the goal of keeping expenditures four and a half billion below the budget estimates.

There are various executive figures in the carry-over. I can find no one who can give any definite answer as to what those figures are.

The total figure of \$37,500,000,000 is not all a question of appropriations. Only about thirty-two and a half billion is concerned with appropriations. Five billion is from last year's appropriations. Those are also being worked on.

So far as I can judge, the proposed cut from the Army and Navy is about what I estimated, about 10 percent of the total figure. The total bill for the armed services was about \$11,200,000,000, and with the rescissions, and cuts in appropriations, I estimate we will save about \$1,200,000,000, just about 10 percent of the total amount that was requested.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has made quite a study of the budget in connection with the tax bill, and I wonder if he would mind relating to the Senate the items which make up \$4,500,000,000 reduction in expenditures.

Mr. TAFT. I have four pages of the items which I made at the beginning of this session, and which I should be glad to show the Senator, but I can hardly go into them all in detail at this time. At that time I reached a total of about \$5,800,000,000, and after deducting items which I think will not be realized, I brought my figure down to about \$4,800,000,000.

The largest item was the Army appropriation, to which I referred. My estimate for the agricultural appropriation was \$150,000,000, less saving than in the bill which has just been proposed in the House, and I imagine we will have to put back some of that.

The estimate in the case of Federal Security was of a saving of about \$50,000,000 less than I estimated.

As to the Navy, we estimated four hundred and fifty-one million. The proposed cut is three hundred and seventy-eight million, but that does not include the rescissions from carry-over last year, so the estimate will be approximately reached.

For the Labor Department I figured savings of only \$5,000,000. There has been proposed \$24,000,000.

For the State Department the figure is \$61,000,000, which is a great deal more than I had estimated.

All we can say now and all we can say 3 weeks from now is that if a complete force of actuaries were to figure this matter out they would differ by a billion dollars. I will venture to say that when we leave here they will differ by a billion dollars as to what the expenditures of the Federal Government will be in the next 12 months.

After all, the President in December overestimated the expenditures by something like a billion and a half dollars for the 6 months of the current year, and underestimated the receipts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will put his tables in the RECORD, because I should like to examine them. I ask the Senator, however, if the actual cuts made in the nine bills which have already been acted on, excluding the \$800,000,000 tax refund provision, and excluding the Commodity Credit provision of \$641,000,000, do not total, as acted on by the House of Representatives, \$1,205,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Probably the Senator is correct. I do not think that includes the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. It does not.

Mr. TAFT. Let us take the Commodity Credit Corporation. I felt when I first saw the figures for that Agency that, to the extent of those figures, the budget was padded. This figure was included in expenditures for the fiscal year 1948, whereas I knew the money was to reimburse the cost of subsidies paid 2 years ago.

Of course we have not saved the money, but nevertheless, when the President presented his \$37,500,000,000 budget, he made it \$800,000,000 higher than I believe it should have been. It seems to me we have a right to say that that amount was padded in 1948, because it either belonged in 1946 or in the current year 1947, and does not belong in 1948. There is no reason why we should be levying taxes in 1948 to pay for current expenditures of 1946.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there is a great deal in what the Senator says, but the fact remains, whether we pay it next year or this year, it is not a reduction of expenditures, it is only a payment of a debt this year instead of next year, and that does not represent a cut in the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. TAFT. I quite agree, but, after all, if the budget is lower, I do not care whether it is paid by recalculating of the budget or is paid by saving money. I think the Senator will recognize that the House has done a good job in cutting, but the Senator thinks probably they have done too much.

Mr. TYDINGS. No, I do not.

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to have the Senator's support.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope they will keep on with their cutting, and as one member of the Committee on Appropriations, I pretty generally supported their cuts in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; indeed, I not only supported them, Mr. President, but I shall claim

eventually a large part of the credit for the savings made.

Mr. TAFT. I should be very glad to give the Senator that credit.

Mr. TYDINGS. Going back to the \$641,000,000 of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it has the effect of cutting down the surplus for this year and adding to the surplus for next year, but it does not represent—and this is my point, with which the Senator has been fair enough to agree—a reduction in expenditures.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I desire to conclude by saying that in connection with the question of delay, we are going to have to base the tax bill on the facts of the moment, which will be approximately the same as the facts 3 weeks from now. If we put off action on the bill, I doubt very much whether we can possibly get the deductions into effect on the 1st of July. The Treasury has quite a task in getting out the new deduction tables and getting them to the employers. The employers have to have them in order to set up their calculating machines for figuring the deductions in wages. We have always been told we must give the Treasury 30 days in order that they may get the withholding tables out and have them made effective.

As to the retroactive feature, the House reduced taxes from the 1st of January for the whole year. The result was that the new deductions would be put into effect the 1st of July, and it would have been necessary for the Government to give back a check to reimburse for the extra taxes that have been collected during the first 6 months.

We felt that was unwise. We felt it would be purely inflationary for people to receive checks they did not expect to get. We have been concerned that the tax reduction should begin on the first day of July, that on that day every citizen should receive either a 30-percent or a 20-percent cut in the deductions previously made, that his checks may then be increased as of that day, so that we do not have to give him a refund check to take care of money which we have overdeducted. Of course, it is not so essential for people who pay in quarterly installments, because their first cut, of either 20 percent, 10 percent, or 30 percent, will come on the 15th of September. But if it is desired to get these deductions into effect—and this affects, I think, something over 30,000,000 taxpayers—the bill should be promptly passed. It should be passed in order that there may be no doubt whatever that those cuts begin with the wages which begin on the 1st day of July. I think that is what the people expect. It makes it very complicated to do it any other way, or to begin it at a later period; and I think that alone is a reason not to delay the particular action which is proposed at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Would it be more complicated to follow House bill 1, which makes the tax reduction retroactive to January 1?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; in my opinion it would; because the deductions of 20 percent begin on the 1st of January, and there will be an overcollection for 6 months from 44,000,000 taxpayers. Sooner or later checks will have to be written and mailed to them, presumably as soon as it is possible to draw the checks. That is a very considerable thing. It would affect every taxpayer. There is a certain number of adjustments at the present time, but that particular pay-roll deduction is not nearly so difficult as it would have been under the House bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I make is, the House apparently did not consider the Senator's argument as a valid one, because they overwhelmingly passed a bill which made tax reduction retroactive as of January 1.

Mr. TAFT. I do not always agree with the House. They seemed to feel that they had to do it. I always opposed it, as the Senator knows, and I think it would have been a great mistake to make a retroactive tax cut.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. To whom does the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, what is the remaining time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado has 19 minutes to his credit.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall yield that to myself.

Mr. President, we are asked to postpone consideration of this bill until June 10. The reasons advanced are that by June 10, the House Appropriations Committee will have reported all of the major appropriation bills; that from these reports we would be in better position to estimate the amount of expenditure reductions in fiscal 1948; that this would put us into improved position to judge the merits of the bill before us.

It is respectfully suggested that the proposal is unsound for many reasons.

To start with, we have no way of knowing how many appropriation bills will have been reported by the House Appropriations Committee by June 10. We have no way of knowing what the House, the Senate, and the conferees will do to bills which have not progressed beyond the reporting stage in the House of Representatives. Indeed, we have no way of knowing what the two Houses might do to the reports of the conferees.

If it is sound to argue for such a delay in order to secure a little more incomplete information which could serve no purpose except to stimulate additional conjecture and difference of opinion, it would be sound on June 10 and thereafter to ask for successive delays for the same reason until the House, the Senate, the conferees, and finally both Houses had disposed of all of the bills.

Let no one be naive enough to believe that these possibilities have escaped attention and would not be fully exploited by those who follow the administration's policy of no-income-tax-reduction bill this year.

The junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], during the debate the other day, demonstrated that June 10 is

ineffectual as a reliable date for information when he pointed out that last year the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill did not become law until June 22; the District of Columbia appropriation bill, until July 9; the Interior Department appropriation bill, until July 1; the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, until July 26; the legislative appropriation bill, until July 1; the War Department appropriation bill, until July 16; the Navy Department appropriation bill, until July 8; and the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, until July 5.

Now, even if we knew to the last dollar the totals of our appropriation bills this year, we would continue to be in the field of estimate as to the expenditures for fiscal 1948. This comes about through the fact that money appropriated does not necessarily measure the amount of money expended during a given fiscal year.

For example, last August, after all of the appropriation bills had become law, the expenditure estimate then made for the then fiscal year 1947 by the Bureau of the Budget was forty-one billion five hundred million. In January 1947, despite the fact that the Bureau of the Budget knew to the last penny the amount of prior appropriations, it revised its expenditure estimate for fiscal 1947 to \$42,500,000,000, an increase of \$1,000,000,000 over its estimate of August 1947. More recently, on April 19, 1947, the Bureau of the Budget again revised its expenditure estimate for fiscal 1947 to \$41,250,000,000, a reduction of one billion two hundred and fifty million from its previous January estimate.

How does this come about?

Revisions of that kind result from the effects of rescissions, from the fact that appropriations are not always completely spent during any particular fiscal year, from control of the rate of expenditure, from administrative economies, and so forth.

Running along with changes in estimates of expenditures caused by the operation of factors such as those mentioned are changes in estimated revenues. In a word, there is never a static point from which the whole picture can be seen without the benefit of estimate. On June 10 some things might be clearer and others more obscure. This explains why, as was developed during the debate by the able junior Senator from Maine, that we have passed revenue bills at all different stages of congressional sessions which, of necessity had to be based upon future estimates and conditions. I believe that this is probably the first time that time itself has been asked to stand still so that the hazards of estimating might be minimized.

We all know that under the Legislative Reorganization Act, we should finish this session by July 31. Therefore, our work will be greatly intensified by June 10. The appropriation bills will start coming in June and we know without any doubt, that many of their items will be subject to heated and protracted debate. We will be in the middle of a flood of other legislation that will pour out of the

committees onto the calendar for attention before adjournment.

To inject this income-tax reduction bill into that situation will bottleneck the whole legislative program, will kill the bill, or delay its passage so long that it could not possibly become effective, as planned, on July 1.

Do I depart from seemly innocence when I suggest that there may be many Senators who would gleefully join in bringing that about?

Many new forms must go to the taxpayer and employer well ahead of July 1. There will be new rules and regulations. There will be no time for their preparation and distribution and for the necessary adjustments of the taxpayer and employer if this bill is to mangle its way through June.

We believe that our 49,000,000 income taxpayers are entitled to the benefits of this bill without delay. We are not unmindful of the predictions of recession. We know that no better buttress against recession can be found than income-tax reduction. We are also aware that it takes about 1 year for the full effects of income-tax reduction to be felt. Our gloomiest recessionists thus have their own special reason for losing no time in getting this measure into operation.

It is our plan to make this bill effective July 1, and this has important relation and sequence to the fact that there will be presented to the Congress early the next session a general revision bill to correct other injustices and inequities in our tax structure which have been accumulating a long time. The House Ways and Means Committee has already commenced its preparations and hearings. The Treasury is cooperating.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, while not vouching for it and maintaining what I thought was some skeptical reserve, predicted that expenditure reductions reflecting true savings might reach as much as \$2,786,000,000. In arriving at this figure, the Senator excluded the \$800,000,000 reduction by the House in the \$2,000,000,000 item in the executive budget for refund of receipts in the fiscal year 1948.

Passing for the present the questions raised as to this item, and for discussion's sake accepting as achievable the expenditure reduction figure of \$2,786,000,000, the estimated expenditures in fiscal 1948 would be thirty-four and seven-tenths billions. Estimating income payments for fiscal 1948 at one hundred and seventy billions, the existing tax system will produce revenues in that year of \$41,400,000,000.

Deducting expenditures of thirty-four and seven-tenths billion, there is a surplus of six and seven-tenths billion for debt retirement, tax reduction, and contingencies. Subtracting \$3,200,000,000, the cost of the bill before us, we have three and five-tenths billion for debt retirement and contingencies. Deducting the Senate's goal of two and six-tenths billion for debt retirement, we have \$900,000,000 for additional debt reduction or for contingencies.

I have shown the effects of the expenditure reduction figure of the Senator from Georgia of \$2,786,000,000 to dem-

onstrate the wide margins of safety within which we marked up this bill. The Senator's figures fall short of the Senate's goal of expenditure reduction by \$1,714,000,000, and yet there is room for meeting the Senate's debt reduction goal and for a sizable contingency fund.

We shaped this bill with the definite purpose that our margins should be ample to meet even more conservative views than our own, to allow for substantial errors or contingencies.

We tried to arrive at a sound position between the estimates of no recession and those of complete disaster.

The House bill as it came to us would have cost the revenues four and nine-tenths billions on the basis of national income payments of \$170,000,000,000. The House bill was fully retroactive to January 1, 1947.

Allowing for the cost of the House bill, and assuming the Senate's expenditure reduction goal, there would have been a surplus for debt retirement and contingencies of \$3,500,000,000. This would have taken care of the Senate's program of debt reduction of \$2,600,000,000 with \$900,000,000 left over for contingencies as contrasted with the Administration's contingency allowance in the budget for 1948 of \$25,000,000 and debt reduction of \$1,400,000,000.

But out of an abundance of caution, with the object of conforming our bill so that there would be generous allowance for contingencies and speculations of the type which we have heard here, the Senate Committee on Finance decided to eliminate the retroactive features of H. R. 1.

This increased our estimated surplus, after giving effect to the cost of H. R. 1, as so amended, to \$5,200,000,000, enough to take care of the Senate's debt reduction goal of \$2,600,000,000 with an equal amount left over for further debt reduction or contingencies.

We have had much discussion as to the expenditure side of the budget. We have shown, I believe, that our safety margins are ample to protect against sizable failure, if that unfortunately should occur, in meeting our Senate goal of expenditure reduction.

Now let me discuss how we reached our estimate of revenue receipts and of national-income payments of \$170,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948.

Remember, please, that \$170,000,000,000 of national-income payments translates into our estimate of tax revenues for the fiscal year 1948 of \$41,400,000,000. National-income payments are a standard reference point used by the Treasury and by the technical staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and by all other authorities known to me, for the calculation of tax revenues.

We examined the annual rate of national-income payments for the first quarter of the present calendar year. It is \$176,000,000,000. Had we accepted that rate for the fiscal year 1948, our surplus, after paying the costs of this bill, would have been six and five-tenths billion.

On the Treasury's theory of no recession, we would have been justified in accepting one hundred and seventy-six bil-

lion as the income-payment rate for the fiscal year 1948. We preferred to base ourselves on an estimate which would take into account an orderly downward adjustment, some recession, a recession of such magnitude as to increase unemployment from the present level of about two and five-tenths million to about four million. We are not predicting such a recession. We estimated it in the interests of proper caution.

One hundred and seventy billion dollars of national-income payments for the fiscal year 1948 coincides with a drop in the present physical volume of industrial production from its present index number of around 190 down to an average of 171 for the fiscal year 1948. It would represent a drop in commodity prices from the present price line of about 149 to an average for fiscal year 1948 of 136.

This will illustrate to the Senate the basis of the statement that in adopting the income-payment estimate of one hundred and seventy billion for the fiscal year 1948, we were acting conservatively. In adopting the Senate's version of expenditure reduction of \$4,500,000,000, we also adopted the conservative course as between the House and the Senate. Had we adopted the House version of \$6,000,000,000 expenditure reduction, our estimated surplus would have been six and seven-tenths billions instead of \$5,200,000,000.

But I believe it has been demonstrated that the five and two-tenths billions is abundantly ample for our planned debt reduction, for reasonable discounts which anyone wishes to apply to our estimates, and for contingencies.

Let me again remind the Senate that reduction of taxes does not necessarily mean reduction of tax revenues. This was shown by our tax-reduction experiences in the 1920's. It is a well-known fact that restoring to the people their freedom to spend their own money is in aid of a dynamic economy. The circulation of money in the hands of the people has rapid velocity. It gives direct support to the consumer-goods market. The national income is increased and that increases revenue receipts.

This experience is not confined to the Federal Government. New York State reduced its tax on individual incomes by a flat 25 percent for the years 1941 to 1944, inclusive, and by a flat 50 percent for 1945. Another 50-percent cut has been recommended for the fiscal year 1946. Nevertheless, revenues have increased from four hundred and sixty-five million in 1940 to six hundred and eighty-two million in 1946, and a deficit of 1940 has given place to an unbroken series of surpluses, the largest of which occurred in 1946. In spite of the 50-percent cut, a surplus of \$60,700,000 is estimated for the fiscal year 1947.

Since the end of World War II, Australia has twice reduced its income tax. The tax program which included the first of these reductions was estimated at the time to cost between two and three million pounds. Instead the tax reductions were followed by an increase in revenue of £17,000,000. I interject to say that

Canada is passing an income-tax-reduction bill, the percentages of reduction in which are much the same as our own, and it, too, will go into effect on July 1.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia during the debate on our tax-reduction bill of 1945 put it this way—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 8, page 9948:

The rate of tax does not determine what comes into the Treasury. The bill, so far as it affects corporations, is properly a tax-rate-reducing bill. It will not necessarily reduce the amount of revenue coming in. Indeed, if it has the effect, which it is hoped it will have, it will so stimulate the expansion of business as to bring in a greater total revenue. I think if one will look back to World War I he will understand precisely what I am now trying to say.

Mr. President, while it is somewhat aside, I shall pause in the presentation of my prepared statement to emphasize this fact: The Revenue Act of 1918 was approved February 24, 1919, some months after the actual cessation of hostilities. In a sense, that act was both a war-tax act and an immediate post-war tax-rate-reduction act, since it provided one schedule of rates for 1918 and a somewhat lower schedule for 1919, 1920, and 1921. The act of November 23, 1921, made more substantial reductions in rates. The recovery of the country from a state of depression in 1920 and 1921 was rapid. The Revenue Acts of 1924 and 1926 made still further tax reductions, but the income from tax revenues of the Government increased through all of that period.

Mr. President, I affirm that this bill is on a sound budgetary basis, and I hope that the motion to delay its consideration will be defeated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time to the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall occupy the attention of the Senate for the remaining moments available for this debate, in support of the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to postpone consideration of the pending legislation until the 10th of June.

I realize that on that date we may not have all the information that would be desirable to enable us to act intelligently with regard to any tax reductions at this time or at this session; but as has already been so forcibly said by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] by the date fixed in his motion we shall certainly have a clearer picture of the probable appropriations of this session of Congress than we have now.

We cannot take into consideration the possibility that all appropriations may not be expended, or that there may be an excess of expenditure, calling for deficiency bills between now and the end of this session. Certainly we do not now have anything approaching a clear indication of the total appropriations which will be enacted by this session of Congress and to that extent we shall be walking up a blind alley. We shall be groping in a field where there is not sufficient light at this time to enable us to plant our feet upon solid ground in the matter of Government income and Government expenses, although I concede that even on that date we may not have all the information that we might wish.

I am one of those who, even before the war had ended, hoped for and predicted a drastic reduction in governmental expenditures and in taxes. Nearly 2 years ago, before the war ended, I expressed the hope and belief that when the war should end and we should have discharged whatever temporary obligations by way of expenditures the aftermath of war required, we could stabilize our national expenditures at somewhere between twenty-two and twenty-five billions of dollars.

When I expressed that hope and belief, I was deeply in earnest in the entertainment of both the hope and belief, but the extension of the war and the necessary assumption of international obligations beyond what we then contemplated have made it impossible to achieve this goal up to the present time, though I am not ready to give up the hope that we may yet reduce our governmental expenditures to somewhere near the figure which I have indicated.

When the President submitted his budget of \$37,500,000,000, which represents a scaling down by him of more than \$5,000,000,000 from the requirements and recommendations of the various departments, I was frankly surprised and somewhat disappointed that a smaller total sum had not been recommended, but after going over the budget recommendations in detail and after one or two sessions of the Joint Committee on the Budget, provided for by the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946, I was convinced that the President had done his best to reduce the expenses to the lowest figure which he thought possible or practicable in view of our domestic and international obligations. Notwithstanding this I still entertain the hope that we may reduce the amount somewhat below the budget recommendations.

In an effort to perform our duties under the Reorganization Act, and particularly with reference to section 138 of that act, a Joint Committee on the Budget was appointed by the two Houses of Congress, and after some discussions and controversies the House of Representatives passed a concurrent resolution by which it reduced the President's budget by \$6,000,000,000. When the concurrent resolution came before the Senate an effort was made by Members on both sides of the political fence to deal realistically with the question of the President's budget and any possible reductions below it. We recognized that it would be practically impossible to cut \$6,000,000,000 from the budget estimate, however desirable this result might be. The Senate finally amended the concurrent resolution to provide for a reduction of \$4,500,000,000 below the President's estimates and the concurrent resolution was sent to a conference between the two Houses for the purpose of ironing out the differences and finally enacting the concurrent resolution in some form and some definite figure.

The concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate March 4 last, nearly 3 months ago, and immediately sent to conference. Soon thereafter a brief conference was called by the chairman of the joint committee, Representative JOHN TABER, who is chairman of the House Ap-

propriations Committee. I had assumed before this brief conference was held that the majority members of the joint committee had agreed upon some figure between four and one-half and six billion dollars, and that the conference would be a sort of ratification meeting to act upon the figure previously agreed upon by the majority. We were not even permitted to discuss the figures while they were under discussion in the majority. It was obvious from the beginning that minority Members were not to be taken into the confidence of the majority in the matter of determining the size of the budget.

But it soon developed in this first and only meeting, which was held more than 2 months ago, that the House conferees would not yield by so much as \$1, and the conference was adjourned subject to the call of the Chair. This call has never been issued, and the conferees are helpless to do anything except wait in confusion and futility. It is now obvious to any thinking man that a \$4,500,000,000 or a \$6,000,000,000 reduction will not be achieved when the total appropriations have been enacted into law.

We all supported the Congressional Reorganization Act in good faith. We deem it one of the wisest provisions in that act that Congress should in advance make an intelligent estimate of revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year with a provision for the reduction of the huge public debt by whatever could be saved by a reduction of estimated appropriations and expenditures.

The failure to call a meeting of the conferees under section 138 of the act is a gross disregard of congressional obligation and a gross disregard of the financial interests of the Government of the United States from every possible standpoint. If we judge the immediate future by the immediate past we may assume that no further effort will be made to arrive at a figure which both Houses might adopt and no further effort would be made to assemble the conferees for that purpose.

It is not without just foundation to assume that those who are responsible for the conduct of the public business in the two Houses of Congress and those who start out bravely to reduce the President's budget by anywhere from \$4,500,000,000 to \$6,000,000,000, now realize the impossibility of this task under the program which they have thus far accomplished by way of appropriations and are lacking in the frankness to tell the Congress and the American people of their failure.

But without the guidance of the congressional budget, which was contemplated in the Reorganization Act, certainly by the 10th of June and more certainly by the time the tax bill is considered, if postponed until that date, we would have some knowledge by which we could estimate the ultimate sum total of appropriations that may be made by this session of Congress.

I am not sure, however, Mr. President, that in the minds of the majority this is a matter of any consequence, because House bill 1, which we are now considering and which received its number because it was the first bill introduced in the House of Representatives in this ses-

sion, was introduced in the House on the first day of the session before the Reorganization Act had taken effect, before the committees had yet been organized or appointed, before the President had even submitted his budget to the Congress, and before either House had had an opportunity to discuss or to consider what our total probable expenses would be in regard to the payment of our debt and the support of our obligations in this session of the Congress.

This estimate of expenditures is subject to the contingency that even after regular appropriation bills have been enacted there will be deficiency appropriation bills which will include items eliminated from the regular bills, which will undoubtedly increase the total amount for the fiscal year beginning July 1. There has been much said about the resistance of departments and agencies against the reductions of their respective appropriations. We may concede this. This habit is not peculiar to any particular bureau or department, nor to any political party, nor any administration. It has been true from time immemorial. But if we are to have any accurate information concerning the possibility of a balanced budget, the possibility of substantial debt reduction and the possibility of an accurate estimate of Treasury expenditures, we must have a clearer picture of the appropriations that will come out of this session of Congress beyond what we possess at this time. I do not desire to embark upon any discussion of partisan politics in connection with this important matter, but it is somewhat strange that those who now constitute a majority in both Houses of Congress have apparently abandoned their historical role as proponents of sound governmental financial policy and a balanced budget. House bill 1, a tax-reduction bill, without the slightest information, took on importance far beyond that of other obligations and duties of the Government of the United States.

I think the American people would like to see a balanced budget, and I think they would like to see our governmental finances stabilized upon a permanent basis, and not merely for a year or two, with the constant fear that our finances might revert to deficit spending and a further increase in our national debt.

It seems to me that nothing could be more discouraging to the American people and the economy of the American people than to vote for a temporary expedient in order to reduce taxes in a single year, with no assurance that future exigencies growing out of governmental obligations would not require an early increase in taxes, or an early increase in the public debt, instead of its gradual decrease, under any sound financial policy.

From time immemorial the Republican Party, now in charge of both Houses, has boasted it was the party of sound economic policy and practices, that it favored a balanced budget, that it favored the protection of the national credit. Although our friends on the other side have consistently complained since 1933 of an unbalanced budget, they rarely, if ever, refer to the fact that the national budget has not been balanced

since the second year of the Hoover administration.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] a moment ago referred to the fact that the budget had been unbalanced for the past 15 years. If he had desired to be completely accurate, he would have said 17 years, because the budget has been unbalanced ever since 1930, the second year of the Hoover administration. In that administration the public debt was increased from \$16,000,000,000 to more than \$22,000,000,000, in a period of profound peace, not only in the United States but in the world.

If I wanted to be partisan, which I do not want to be, I would say that that administration plunged us into the greatest depression that the world had ever seen, experienced, or imagined. Out of it this increase of \$6,500,000,000 in the public debt emerged.

Now that they have assumed the responsibility of financial legislation in both branches of the Congress, they seem willing to take the chances that events will repudiate their previous protestation of sound financial policies.

Let us take the situation as it appears from the record. As the Secretary of the Treasury said before the Senate Committee on Finance, the Treasury estimates are neither optimistic nor pessimistic with respect to revenues and expenditures. There is uncertainty in the economic outlook and it would be decidedly unwise to plan the national finances over the next fiscal year on the basis of the most optimistic assumptions which we might entertain. This is not to be construed as a forecast of a depression, large or small, but it is rather an effort to lean in the direction of a safe figure for prospects of financial planning. There are no hazards in such a course, for even if there is no decline in the level of income payments for the remainder of 1947, the surplus for the fiscal year 1948 will still be only approximately \$4,000,000,000.

Enactment of the Senate Finance Committee tax bill would, under favorable assumption that present levels of income payments will be maintained, still leave less than \$1,000,000,000 for debt retirement. We get an excessive surplus only by assuming that the \$37,500,000,000 of expenditures estimated in the President's budget will actually be cut by several billion dollars.

A while ago the Senator from Ohio conceded, very fairly, I think, in a colloquy with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] that when we eliminate \$800,000,000 it is a phony reduction, because it has to be paid some day, and the longer it is postponed the more it will amount to, because it will draw 6 percent interest from the time the obligation is incurred, estimated, or ascertained, until it is paid. The bookkeeping saving represents only a transfer from one ledger to another, or a bookkeeping arrangement between the Treasury and the Commodity Credit Corporation. We can see now only a reduction of \$1,200,000,000 in the estimated expenses of the Government.

The Treasury estimates of receipts for the fiscal year of 1948, based on \$168,000,000,000 national income, is \$38,000,-

000,000. For every \$10,000,000,000 in income payments above this level receipts are likely to increase by two or two and one-half billion. Thus, if income payments remain at their current level at about \$177,000,000,000 during the entire fiscal year of 1948, Treasury receipts will probably be about \$41,500,000,000 under the present revenue laws. At this level of income payments the enactment of the Senate Finance Committee tax bill would reduce receipts by approximately three and one-half to four billion dollars, or a total of about thirty-seven and one-half or thirty-eight billion dollars per annum. It seems clear, therefore, that unless the President's budget of \$37,500,000,000 is reduced substantially there would be little or no debt retirement in the fiscal year of 1948, even under these favorable assumptions regarding the level of income payments.

The reductions in appropriations already made in bills passed by the House do not bear out the contention that the President's budget can be reduced to \$33,000,000,000, the amount assumed in the report by Senate Finance Committee on House bill 1. That matter has already been so amply explained by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that I shall not undertake to discuss it at this point. These reductions now aggregate about \$1,500,000,000, of which \$800,000,000 is for tax refunds which will have to be appropriated for during the next session of Congress, even if it is not appropriated now. The real savings, therefore, under the President's budget are thus only about \$850,000,000. The loan to Greece and Turkey will offset a substantial portion of this amount. To bring the estimate down to \$33,000,000,000, Congress would have to cut the remaining appropriations by about \$4,000,000,000.

The reduction of some \$4,000,000,000 in the remaining appropriation would have to be obtained mainly from the War and Agriculture Departments and the Veterans' Administration. I do not know yet what will happen to the appropriation bills for the War Department and the Veterans' Administration. We do know what has happened in the House of Representatives regarding the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, and the action of the House in regard to that bill has brought forth sharp protests from many persons in all sections of the United States, not excluding a prominent gentleman on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber, who has a genuine interest in the welfare of agriculture in the United States.

However, a reduction of such magnitude in these key appropriation bills is obviously unlikely. The Navy Department appropriation recently passed by the House saves \$378,000,000 out of a total request of \$3,800,000,000, or about 10 percent. The same percentage saving in the remaining items cannot be achieved, because they contain many fixed commitments. However, even if this optimistic assumption is made, an additional saving of only about \$2,000,000,000 would be obtained. Thus, the

total budget reduction based on this optimistic assumption, without allowing any offsetting increase for new foreign loans, would be about \$2,850,000,000.

By way of summary, an optimistic estimate of receipts in the fiscal year of 1948 is \$41,500,000,000, and an optimistic estimate of the size of the budget is \$35,000,000,000, leaving a surplus of \$6,500,000,000. But it would be unwise to proceed on the assumption that such a surplus will be available for debt retirement and tax reduction, since it leaves no room for error either in the receipts or expenditures figures. With income payments of \$177,000,000,000, the Senate Finance Committee tax-reduction bill would reduce this surplus by \$3,500,000,000. If receipts fall below the most optimistic estimate or if expenditures are not cut to the indicated \$35,000,000,000, the margin for debt retirement would be less than \$3,000,000,000. Under present conditions, sound management of our financial affairs warrants action on tax reduction only after we are reasonably certain that there is sufficient surplus for a substantial installment on debt retirement.

We all know we cannot pass on to future generations this stupendous public debt of \$257,000,000,000. We all know that the time for debt payments is in the midst of high income and prosperity. We all know that if by any chance there should be a decline of income for 10,000,000 people, the result would be a reduction of three billion in the income of the Treasury, which would wipe out all possibility of debt reduction under this pending tax bill.

On page 7 of the Senate Finance Committee report there is the following statement:

The economy is not as fully employed as the Secretary (of the Treasury) seems to believe. Unemployment as reported by the Department of Commerce is running now at about 2,400,000 persons. This compares with 650,000 persons during the autumn of 1944, when it can reasonably be said that the economy was fully employed in a fairly absolute sense.

Unemployment of 2,400,000 persons out of a total labor force of almost 60,000,000 does not constitute proof that the economy is operating at less than capacity. At what is usually called full employment, some frictional and seasonal unemployment may be expected. The unemployment level of 650,000 during the autumn of 1944 indicated such a severe shortage of labor that Government controls were necessary for the proper allocation of the short supply. During peacetime, an unemployment figure of 2,400,000 is very close to the minimum in a free economy in which wage earners freely shift from job to job. Production is already at a record peacetime high, and additional output is limited by shortages in supplies of raw material, machinery, equipment, and labor, and by maladjustments in the price structure, rather than by the incomplete use of available production resources.

On page 9 of the Senate Finance Committee report we find the following statement:

A tax reduction will be a hedge against recession and accumulated deflation and should be enacted now.

It is agreed that tax reduction is desirable to help combat a prospective recession. The important question is to determine when the tax reduction would be most effective. Under present conditions, it is hazardous to reduce taxes in anticipation of a recession. Business is operating at capacity, and inflationary pressures still persist in the economy. Tax reduction now would contribute further to the maintenance of inflationary prices. By contributing to further inflation at the present time, we might increase the severity of any recession in business which might occur in the coming fiscal year. Tax reduction for bolstering mass purchasing power and incentives will be appropriate only after the inflationary trend has been arrested and the necessary price adjustments have been made. The best contribution that we can make to economic stability at the present time is to balance the budget and to obtain a sufficiently large surplus to permit a proper payment on the national debt.

On page 10 of the Senate Finance Committee report on this bill, we find the following statement:

It is desirable to concentrate any reduction which can be made at this time in the individual income tax. Only through the individual income tax is it possible to give relief to all persons bearing heavy tax burdens.

There is no sound reason for confining tax revision to any one tax. All major taxes have important effects on incentives and the equity of the tax structure. We should revise not only the individual income tax but also the corporation income tax, the excise taxes, and the estate and gift taxes. In this connection, attention must be given to the problems of double taxation of dividend income and of different forms of business enterprise, the carry-over of net operating losses, the tax treatment of family income, and other features of the tax structure. Wise and careful attention will be required to determine the changes which would benefit our economy most. Since many of these adjustments will lose revenue, a premature tax reduction at an annual rate of \$4,000,000,000 may prejudice these important questions and prejudice the development of a sound postwar tax system.

On page 13 of the committee report, we find the following statement:

The decisions of the executives who receive relatively large salaries are of greatest importance with reference to the development of industrial production. The savings of the middle and upper bracket income recipients are the principal sources of the venture capital for business expansion.

Under present tax rates, national income is at a record peacetime high. The limitations on investment and production are not the result of lack of investment and managerial incentives. As already noted, new investment and additional production is limited by shortages in the supply of raw material, machinery, equipment, and labor, and by high prices.

No one group has a monopoly on supplying capital and establishing new businesses. The American economy has always depended, and must always depend, on a healthy group of new small business.

These new enterprises are often started by persons of modest means who, by combining their small capital and personal effort, build great enterprises from small beginnings. It is well-known that the ownership of stock in American corporations is widely distributed among all income brackets. Statistics of income show that nearly 50 percent of the dividends received by individuals are received by persons with incomes of less than \$5,000 per annum.

On page 14 of the committee's report, we find the following statement:

Special relief is warranted at this time for persons who have attained the age of 65. At the hearings on this bill the Secretary of the Treasury did not oppose the giving of special relief to persons aged 65 or over but argued that the appropriate method of doing so would be action under the Social Security Act. It is worth noting that the coverage of the social-security legislation is by no means universal. Relief under it would not extend to a great number of the people over 65 who now find themselves in an unusually straitened condition.

All families with low fixed incomes have suffered as a result of the increase in the cost of living. Persons under 65 with low fixed incomes have as urgent a claim as those over 65. This provision of the bill would remove one and one-half million from the tax rolls, but it would still leave on the tax rolls more than 46,000,000 people, many of whom pay in taxes less than the costs of collection. Personally, I do not object to a general provision granting \$500 additional exemption to those over 65 years of age. Such an exemption necessarily must apply to all persons over 65, regardless of their income, because it would be administratively difficult, if not impossible, to draw a line between those above 65 who should get such relief and those who do not need it. The truth is that, regardless of age, there ought to be an increase in the amount of exemption allowed under the tax laws so as to remove between four and five million persons who actually do not pay enough in income taxes to justify the collection expense; and any permanent tax bill enacted now or hereafter must take into consideration the wisdom and justice of increasing the personal exemptions beyond those allowed by the present law.

Those of us who support the motion to postpone the consideration of this bill to June 10, or to any other date, do not take this position because of any sentimental objection to tax reductions. We recognize the necessity of appropriate, well-considered, tax reductions at an appropriate time. We emphatically assume the position that existing wartime taxes cannot be continued permanently, or for a very long period in the future. We were responsible for tax reduction last year aggregating more than \$6,000,000,000, in which we included a reduction across the board for all individual taxpayers. But we believe that no tax reduction that is based upon political expediency can be sound.

Mr. President, another matter to which I think we should give consideration today in regard to this tax bill is its timing. All of us are supposed to be concerned about the credit of our country, about its solvency, about its ability to pay its debts,

and about the confidence of the American people in that solvency. We believe that is important because we believe that the millions of holders of United States bonds, which they have purchased in the stress of war emergencies, both for patriotic reasons and reasons of investments and savings, are entitled to feel a supreme confidence in the solvency of their Government. We believe that if the American people holding more than \$50,000,000,000 of E, F, and G bonds, and American banks holding \$92,000,000,000 worth of Government securities—making a total of \$142,000,000,000 out of our great national debt of \$257,000,000,000—ever lose faith in the solvency of their Government and its ability to discharge its obligations, there will be a rush to dispose of these bonds, that not only will involve the credit of the Government of the United States, but might bring on a real depression that not only would affect every American citizen and every American institution, but would have its disastrous repercussions around the world.

Mr. President, if by any chance we should be able to make a tax reduction now and if by any chance we might also make a debt reduction now, if economic conditions should be reversed in 1948 or 1949 and we should then find that under the tax rate we now write into the law there was a Treasury deficit which would preclude the possibility of making any debt reduction, it is not difficult to imagine what might happen to the \$142,000,000,000 of our debts which I have just mentioned, based on our Government bonds and other Government obligations, for the very moment the American people begin to lose confidence in the solvency of their Government and in its ability in an orderly manner to pay off the debt of \$257,000,000,000, at that moment the holders of these bonds would become the victims of fear, and not only individuals but banks would rush in prematurely to liquidate the bonds or to cash them, so that they might not be the further victims of any lack of confidence on the part of the people of the United States in the Solvency of their Government. As I have pointed out, if such a situation were to develop, it might well bring about not only a recession, but a collapse of our economy, which not only would affect those of us in the United States, but by the same token would emphasize and expand the chaos and uncertainty throughout the world, because the world's economy and the ability of the other nations of the world to employ and to produce and to recover from their present situation depend more upon the solvency and the credit of the United States than upon the solvency and credit of all the other governments of the world combined. In my judgment, we cannot afford to take a chance on having our own people lose faith in their own Government.

Mr. President, I myself need tax reduction as much as any other man, if not more, but so far as I am concerned, I myself would rather continue to pay for another year the taxes that are now imposed upon me, in the hope that we might then see the foundation of financial solidity upon which we might plant our feet, and in the meantime bring about

an orderly tax reduction and an orderly debt reduction and a balanced budget for the benefit of our Government and our people.

Let us, therefore, approach this vital and important subject with caution and in the light of the facts. Let us see a little further into the future before we commit ourselves to a policy which we may not be able to reverse, even though a necessity for a reversal should arrive.

For these reasons, I support the motion to postpone the consideration of this tax bill until June 10, and for the same reasons I shall support the amendment to make the tax reductions effective January 1, 1948, instead of making them retroactive to January 1, 1947. Certainly by the end of the present calendar year, we may form some accurate estimate of our economic situation in the immediate future. In the light of this fuller information, we may be able to give to the American people both tax reductions and debt reductions to an extent which will inspire their confidence in the statesmanship of the American Congress and the stability of the American economic and financial system.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion to postpone until the 10th of June, because even if our action on the tax bill is postponed until that date, we still shall have time to pass a tax bill and there still will be time for the Treasury Department to make out the necessary forms, and there still will be time for the withholding taxes to be imposed—if that is the will of the Congress—beginning on the first day of July. But, in addition to that, as I have said whenever this tax bill is voted upon, I shall vote to postpone its effective date until January 1, 1948, because by that time we shall have an even clearer picture of our financial obligations, and thus may be able to trim our sails according to the wind which may be prevailing at that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the time under the unanimous-consent agreement has expired. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to postpone until June 10, 1947, the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income tax payments.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered for their names:

Aiken	Eaton	Lodge
Baldwin	Ellender	Lucas
Ball	Ferguson	McCarran
Barkley	Flanders	McClellan
Brewster	Fulbright	McFarland
Bricker	George	McGrath
Bridges	Green	McKellar
Brooks	Gurney	McMahon
Buck	Hatch	Magnuson
Bushfield	Hawkes	Malone
Butler	Hayden	Martin
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Cain	Hill	Millikin
Capehart	Hoey	Moore
Capper	Holland	Morse
Chavez	Ives	Murray
Connally	Jenner	Myers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel
Donnell	Kem	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Dworshak	Knowland	Reed
Eastland	Langer	Revercomb

Robertson, Va.	Taylor	Wagner
Robertson, Wyo.	Thomas, Okla.	Watkins
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Saltonstall	Thye	White
Smith	Tobey	Wiley
Sparkman	Tydings	Williams
Stewart	Umstead	Wilson
Taft	Vandenberg	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to postpone to June 10, 1947, the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments.

Mr. GEORGE and others asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If he were present he would vote "nay," and if I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY (when Mr. McCARTHY's name was called). The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has announced his pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that on this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is absent by leave of the Senate, would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—44

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Connally	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Downey	McCarran	Russell
Eastland	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McFarland	Stewart
Fulbright	McGrath	Taylor
George	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Maybank	Tydings
Hayden	Morse	Umstead
Hill	Murray	Wagner
Hoey	Myers	Wilson
Holland	O'Connor	

NAYS—48

Aiken	Dworshak	Moore
Baldwin	Eaton	Reed
Ball	Ferguson	Revercomb
Brewster	Flanders	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Gurney	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Taft
Buck	Ives	Thye
Bushfield	Jenner	Tobey
Butler	Kem	Vandenberg
Cain	Knowland	Watkins
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Capper	Lodge	White
Cooper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—3

McCarthy	Magnuson	Overton
----------	----------	---------

So Mr. GEORGE's motion to postpone was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LUCAS. I offer an amendment to H. R. 1, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947.'

"Sec. 2. Increase in personal exemptions. "Section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits of individual against net income) is hereby amended by striking out '\$500', wherever appearing therein, and by inserting in lieu thereof '\$600', and by striking '\$1,000' and by inserting in lieu thereof '\$1,200'.

"Sec. 3. Income of husband and wife.

"So much of section 12 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the computation of surtax) as precedes the table therein is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Computation of surtax—

"(1) Separate return: Except in the case of a joint return by husband and wife, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual a surtax determined by computing a tentative surtax under the table set forth in paragraph (3) of this subsection, and by reducing such tentative surtax by 5 percent thereof.

"(2) Joint return: In the case of a joint return by husband and wife under section 51, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the aggregate surtax net income of the husband and wife a surtax determined—

"(A) by computing a tentative surtax under the table set forth in paragraph (3) of this subsection upon an amount equal to one-half of such aggregate surtax net income;

"(B) by multiplying the tentative surtax ascertained under subparagraph (A) by two; and

"(C) by reducing the amount ascertained under subparagraph (B) by 5 percent thereof.

"(3) Surtax table: The table referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) is as follows:.

"Sec. 4. Standard deduction.

"Section 23 (aa) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the optional standard deduction for individuals) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Allowance: In the case of an individual, at his election a standard deduction, as follows:

"(A) Separate return with adjusted gross income \$5,000 or more: Except in the case of a joint return by husband and wife, if the adjusted gross income is \$5,000 or more, the standard deduction shall be \$500.

"(B) Joint return with adjusted gross income \$5,000 or more: In the case of a joint return by husband and wife under section 51, if the aggregate adjusted gross income of the husband and wife is \$5,000 or more, the standard deduction shall be \$1,000 or an amount equal to 10 percent of such aggregate adjusted gross income, whichever is the lesser.

"(C) Adjusted gross income less than \$5,000: If the adjusted gross income is less than \$5,000, the standard deduction shall be an amount equal to 10 percent of the adjusted gross income upon the basis of which the tax applicable to the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer is determined under the tax table provided in section 400.

"Sec. 5. Reduction in surtax on individuals.

"Section 12 (b) of Internal Revenue Code (relating to rates of surtax) is amended by striking everything after the colon and inserting in lieu thereafter the following:

"If the surtax net income is:	The tentative surtax shall be:
Not over \$2,000-----	15 percent of the surtax net income.

"If the surtax net income is:	The tentative surtax shall be:
Over \$2,000 but not over \$4,000.	\$300, plus 17 percent of excess over \$2,000.
Over \$4,000 but not over \$6,000.	\$640, plus 21 percent of excess over \$4,000.
Over \$6,000 but not over \$8,000.	\$1,060, plus 25 percent of excess over \$6,000.
Over \$8,000 but not over \$10,000.	\$1,560, plus 29 percent of excess over \$8,000.
Over \$10,000 but not over \$12,000.	\$2,140, plus 33 percent of excess over \$10,000.
Over \$12,000 but not over \$14,000.	\$2,800, plus 38 percent of excess over \$12,000.
Over \$14,000 but not over \$16,000.	\$3,560, plus 42 percent of excess over \$14,000.
Over \$16,000 but not over \$18,000.	\$4,400, plus 45 percent of excess over \$16,000.
Over \$18,000 but not over \$20,000.	\$5,300, plus 48 percent of excess over \$18,000.
Over \$20,000 but not over \$22,000.	\$6,260, plus 51 percent of excess over \$20,000.
Over \$22,000 but not over \$26,000.	\$7,280, plus 54 percent of excess over \$22,000.
Over \$26,000 but not over \$32,000.	\$9,440, plus 57 percent of excess over \$26,000.
Over \$32,000 but not over \$38,000.	\$12,860, plus 60 percent of excess over \$32,000.
Over \$38,000 but not over \$44,000.	\$16,460, plus 64 percent of excess over \$38,000.
Over \$44,000 but not over \$50,000.	\$20,300, plus 67 percent of excess over \$44,000.
Over \$50,000 but not over \$60,000.	\$24,320, plus 70 percent of excess over \$50,000.
Over \$60,000 but not over \$70,000.	\$31,320, plus 73 percent of excess over \$60,000.
Over \$70,000 but not over \$80,000.	\$38,620, plus 76 percent of excess over \$70,000.
Over \$80,000 but not over \$90,000.	\$46,220, plus 79 percent of excess over \$80,000.
Over \$90,000 but not over \$100,000.	\$54,120, plus 82 percent of excess over \$90,000.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$150,000.	\$62,320, plus 84 percent of excess over \$100,000.
Over \$150,000 but not over \$200,000.	\$104,320, plus 85 percent of excess over \$150,000.
Over \$200,000-----	\$146,820, plus 86 percent of excess over \$200,000.

"Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make such changes in the tables in section 400 (optional tax table) and section 1622 (withholding tables) as may be necessary to reflect the reduction in taxes provided for in the preceding provisions of this act.

"Sec. 7. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by this act shall become effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared on the bill now under discussion in the Senate.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER

Mr. President, at this time, I would like to make a very brief announcement on the so-called community-property or joint-tax amendments. For a long time I have been active in attempting to stir up interest in a proposed amendment to our tax laws which would place citizens of all the States on a basis of tax equality with citizens of the 10 so-called community-property States with respect to payment of individual income taxes. By the terms of my proposals, taxpayers all over the Nation would be given the right to divide family income equally between husband and wife and report that income on separate returns, just as residents of the community-property States now do. On February 5, I had this proposal printed as a suggested amendment to H. R. 1030, and I have also had it prepared as a suggested amendment to the pending bill.

After a careful study of the Federal Government's revenue picture for the fiscal year 1948, I have reluctantly decided not to present either of my amendments at this time. By the terms of the bill we have before us, the Federal Government is giving up revenue amounting to approximately three billion two hundred million for the coming year. My proposed amendment would reduce the estimated revenue by approximately another billion dollars per year. I think we cannot afford to cancel that much additional amount of Federal revenue at the present time.

A number of other Members of the Senate have expressed an interest in this same question, and in fact a number of other bills or amendments have been proposed which would have substantially the same effect as my proposal. I understand that an effort may be made to bring it up on the floor as an amendment to the pending bill. I hope that effort will not be made at this particular time, because of its effects on our 1948 revenue, and because we must have a substantial debt reduction as well as tax reduction.

I am glad to see that so much interest has developed in this question of equalizing tax requirements from citizens in the States not having a community-property law. I feel that the present tax laws constitute a serious discrimination against those States which do not have the community-property law, and I intend to work for removal of this discrimination at the earliest opportunity. I have discussed the question with the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], with the distinguished senior minority member of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and with other leaders on both sides of the aisle. On the basis of these discussions, I believe that the change will have widespread support at the proper time. In fact, I feel confident that it will be included in the general tax-revision bill which is already in process of preparation by the House Committee on Ways and Means. I fear that premature action on our part at the present time would endanger the adoption of the change at a later date. For the reasons stated, I shall refrain from calling up my own proposed amendments on joint-tax privileges, and shall vote against any such proposals that may be presented at this time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. FRED BRADLEY, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate tomorrow, Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BRADLEY, OF MICHIGAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 217) from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 26, 1947.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRED BRADLEY, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the tragic death of Representative FRED BRADLEY is a shock to the Nation and particularly to the State of Michigan which he served so faithfully. He had entered upon his fifth term in the House of Representatives and, at the time of his death, was chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Because of the fact that he attended school in Rogers City, Mich., and had lived in Michigan for many years, he was fully cognizant of the problems of our State. He was honorable and loyal and always had the interests of the people of Michigan and of the Nation at heart. He fought to make the world a better place in which to live, and his life was an inspiration and example to all those who came in contact with him.

Congress is confronted with many very serious problems at the present time and the loss of one with Fred's ability will be keenly felt. He died in the service of his country at his post of duty.

It was my great privilege and an inspiration to know FRED BRADLEY personally, and I join with those who have reason to cherish his memory in this brief tribute to the character of a man who rendered valuable service to his district, the State, and the country as a whole.

We shall indeed be grateful that it was our privilege to serve Congress with FRED BRADLEY, a great American, and we should find courage in the fact that life does not end with death. I feel as

though had he been permitted to say one last word to us he would have said, with the immortal Tennyson:

Sunset and evening star
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark.

For tho' from out our bourne of time and
place

The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate, the President pro tempore of the Senate, speaking from the chair, wishes to associate himself with what has been said by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan regarding the death of Representative FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan. No more earnest, faithful, devoted public servant ever served the public welfare. No finer citizen, no more patriotic American ever gave himself to our congressional labors. He has dedicated 10 years of his life to his district, to his State, and to his Nation in the burdensome activities of his public work. Literally he died in the congressional harness. Michigan and America will miss him in his fine public integrity. His countless friends and his family will miss him and his great loyalties. He was a rugged character in the best tradition of stalwart citizenship. It is with deepest sorrow that we greet the sad news of his untimely passing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Michigan will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 117) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRED BRADLEY, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the second resolving clause the Chair appoints as the committee to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative the senior and junior Senators from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. FERGUSON].

RECESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until

tomorrow, Tuesday, May 27, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Assistant Sanitary Engineer to be Senior Assistant Sanitary Engineer, effective July 12, 1946:

Arthur H. Neill

Assistant Dental Surgeon to be temporary Senior Assistant Dental Surgeon:
Richard P. French

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT

*Cutter, Freeman

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Davis, Edwin C.

ENSIGNS

Anderson, Richard B.	Kern, William A.
Barr, Robert M., Jr.	Matson, George L.
Berglund, Eugene N., Jr.	Murray, Harrison C.
Berude, John B.	Natke, Ernest
Berwanger, George E.	Oellrich, Ernest H.
Bowers, Richard L.	Owens, John D.
Coggins, Carl R.	Pearson, Jack B.
Cole, Floyd C.	Pressell, Harry W.
Coughlan, Robert E., Jr.	Root, William F.
Dickey, Robert M.	Schwartz, Israel L.
*Forshee, Francis L.	Skow, Joseph
Jefferson, James E.	Stone, Warren I.
Johnson, Paul	Taylor, David J.
Karsten, Robert H.	Timidaiski, James T.
	Trekeil, William V.
	Williams, David, Jr.

The following-named officer to the grade and rank indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Abelson, Sol M.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Anderson, Allan N.	Jones, Joseph R.
Bruening, Paul M.	Kiraly, Joseph L.
Buchner, Keith "C"	Knipple, John D.
Calcagno, Peter	Kuhlman, Norman H.
Chupallio, Anthony F.	C.
Clepp, Joseph M.	McKeown, Thomas P.
Darrow, Edward E.	Murison, Richard K.
Dixon, Grover C.	Nash, William T.
Fisher, Albert B., Jr.	Peck, LaVern E.
Fox, Gilbert J.	Petro, John G.
Goldstein, Gerald H.	Selekman, Milton H.
Goodfellow, James P.	Smith, James H.
Greene, James R.	Thompson, Charles E.
Hamel, Carlton E.	Thompson, William A., Jr.
Hamill, William T., Jr.	Jr.
Hanson, Frank L.	Urban, Donald A.
Howard, Joseph E.	Whitchurch, Frank H.

The following-named officers to the grades and rank indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Mitter, Wayne S.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER IN THE NAVY WITH
THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Irwin, James D., Jr.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF GUNNER

Bixby, Norman W.

CHIEF TORPEDOMAN

Smith, Wilbur E.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Early, Justin H.	Lackey, Karl C.
Gospodarich, John	Mayabb, Virgil M.
Hamilton, Robert E.	McCray, James G.
Jones, Samuel L.	Wilson, Charles M.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Farmer, William H.
Stillwell, Louis "C"

CHIEF SHIP'S CLERK

Perry, William B.

CHIEF AEROGRAPHER

Monical, Russell W.

CHIEF PHOTOGRAPHER

Brown, Eduardo P.

CHIEF PHARMACISTS

Barrett, Howard A.	Cook, George W.
Beatson, David C.	Glines, Rankin S.
Bohannon, Ray	Shepherd, Joe W.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 26, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPEAKER'S ROOM,
May 26, 1947.

I hereby designate CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker.

PRAYER

Rev. C. Dale David Doren, pastor, Grace Episcopal Church, Huron, S. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom, whose statutes are good and gracious and whose law is truth, we beseech Thee most humbly to direct and prosper the works and labors of these Thy servants here assembled. Dispose their hearts to the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people, that all things may be so ordered and settled by their honest endeavors upon the best and surest foundations; that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us all for generations.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government.

All which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 23, 1947, was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have

until midnight tonight to file a resolution (H. Res. 218) from the Committee on Rules making in order the bill H. R. 3601.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

The resolution follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3601) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 23, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 236. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals;

H. R. 384. An act for the relief of W. H. Baker and Walter Baker;

H. R. 428. An act for the relief of Charles N. Bemis;

H. R. 444. An act for the relief of the estate of Archie S. Woods, deceased;

H. R. 607. An act to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries;

H. R. 1494. An act for the relief of the estate of Nellie P. Dunn, deceased;

H. R. 1844. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3245. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED BRADLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to announce to the House the sudden passing of the distinguished Representative of the Eleventh Michigan District, the Honorable FRED BRADLEY. He departed this life on Saturday last while on an official visit to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.

This colleague was first elected in 1938 and has served continuously since. Members of this House have been increasingly impressed with his alertness, with his capacity for hard, intelligent, patriotic work, with his determination to do his full duty as he saw it, and with the splendid courage with which he always met the many controversial problems which confronted him. There has been no Member of this House, during my long years here, whose service has im-

pressed me more favorably than his. I deeply regret the passing of this friend.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of a colleague brings to each and every one of us not only grief at the severing of associations, but a somber pondering on the meaning of this enigma of human existence. The mortal sense of life would make of man little more than the grass of the fields, flourishing for a brief season and then withering away. Compared to eternity, the human span is but a twinkling. We are apt to forget that billions of individuals have come and gone; the millions who are now living will, in no great stretch of time, join the silent majority. When we stop to realize by what a narrow margin we cling to that which we call life, we wonder not that some of our colleagues have gone from us, but that more have not gone.

Every tenet of religious faith, every tenet of philosophy, every tenet of logic, every tenet of human hope bids us to be of good cheer, because our colleagues, having passed beyond our ken, are not forever blotted out, but live on and work on.

None can explain the mystery of death. We can hope. None can reason how or why our colleagues should have been called, except that that is the way of flesh. But there is vast consolation, Mr. Speaker, in the hope and the faith that our colleagues, somewhere, in some happier realm, labor on, rising ever upward in their striving to attain truth.

So, instead of grieving as our stricken colleagues depart, we can find it in our hearts to be grateful to infinite being that we were permitted to know them, to be associated with them, to work with them, and to cherish their memories as we hope those left behind when we go will cherish memories of us.

That great philosopher, that kindly gentleman, that able Justice of the Supreme Court, the late Oliver Wendell Holmes, once put into words the hope and the faith that I would voice to you here today. Said he:

I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it has never seen but is to be—that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace.

It seems to be, Mr. Speaker, the common fate of kings and beggars, of just and unjust, of saint and sinner, that each of us shall sometime embark upon that journey from earth to the far yonder shores of an unknown eternity.

So it has been with the colleague and my devoted friend of whom we speak today. May his soul rest in peace to the end of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a long-distance call has been received by one of our colleagues, a member of the Michigan delegation. Congressman FRED BRADLEY, of Rogers City, Mich., left this world last Saturday on a journey from which no traveler returns.

In his desire to serve his country, which he loved devotedly, he contributed every talent he possessed. He symbolized unselfish devotion to duty and responsi-

bility as a legislator and public servant. He was an able man, dynamic and forceful.

His district, the Eleventh, Michigan, consists of 16 counties and is the largest in area in our State. It is one of the most important districts in the Nation because it includes the famous locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

He served the people of his district, with its diversified interests, with all the power at his command. If he ever erred in his zeal to advance their interests, that error was of the head and not of the heart.

He was chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. No Member of this body was better qualified to hold that most important position. He was thoroughly conversant with the subject and possessed an intelligent understanding of its problems.

He yielded all he had, even life itself, in his desire to discharge the trust reposed in him by his electorate.

He died literally standing up in line of duty with his boots on.

The people of his district have lost a true and trusted friend, our State has lost a wise and able counselor, and our Nation has lost a capable legislator and a courageous American.

May an unfaltering Christian faith sustain his widow and his family as it must sustain all of us when the shadows fall across the pathway of life.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we are sad at heart this morning. Death has again invaded our ranks. This time Representative FRED BRADLEY, of the Eleventh Michigan District, has answered the final summons. We are again reminded that nothing is so uncertain in life as life itself.

When the House adjourned for the week end, Mr. BRADLEY was apparently in his usual health, carrying on his duties and meeting the great responsibilities, not only as a Representative of his congressional district but as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, one of the important committees of the Congress. His sudden demise has disrupted a legislative career marked from the beginning by energy, determination, and courage. He always performed the duties at hand in an enthusiastic and capable way. With an adequate background of education and practical business experience, his views and conclusions were inevitably worth while.

Mr. BRADLEY was instinctively a salesman; that is, when he espoused a cause, he immediately became an advocate of the cause and was always on the forefront in selling his views to the Congress and to the country. His sincerity and his integrity were never questioned. He never condemned those who did not agree with him. He always recognized that in great problems of Government there is usually room for controversy, and he liked to talk things over and argue things through. In the end he accepted the judgment of the majority, in keeping with the principles of a representative democracy.

Coming from the great Northland in the great State of Michigan, he loved his district, was proud of its accomplishments, its resources, and the part that section played, and is playing, in the development of the country as a whole.

I never knew FRED BRADLEY until he came to Congress in 1939. Coming as I do from the extreme southern part of the State, I only knew him by reputation. We were all glad to have so able an exponent of our great vacation land in Congress, and he always spoke with authority based on study and personal information. In business life he was most familiar with shipping and the necessity of bringing the industrial part of our State in contact with the vital resources of his district. His particular knowledge in this line naturally qualified him for leadership on the great committee of which he was chairman at the time of his passing. Under his leadership that committee was in the dawn of a new era so far as our merchant marine, our fisheries, and the others matters over which he had jurisdiction are concerned. There was no chairman who ever took his job more seriously, and it is just too bad that his activities have been so abruptly terminated. His place will be difficult to fill at the moment. He was performing an official mission when stricken down. Indeed, it can be truthfully said that he died in the harness.

Mr. Speaker, we all liked FRED BRADLEY. One could not know him and feel otherwise. We sometimes wonder why such a young man with so much to live for should be taken away when the occasion seems so inopportune; however, it is not for us to judge. We must accept the inevitable because it must be for the best. A higher power makes these decisions. We must not mourn, but must rejoice in the fact that FRED BRADLEY lived and worked among us. Many a statute is a better law because he helped write it. Called away at a time when he apparently had most to live for, the shock is the greater. I am sure that we all join in genuine sympathy to his district and his charming wife.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, joy and sorrow are closely intermingled in this busy world of ours. Last week, our departed colleague, FRED BRADLEY, of Rogers City, Mich., was with us—happy and apparently in good health—daily performing his duties as a Member of the great House of Representatives, and more particularly as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Now, he has passed to that "undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns."

Our former colleague was devoted to the service of his country, and the Eleventh District of Michigan had honored him for five consecutive terms in electing him as the United States Representative from that fine district. Fred was adequately prepared for the duties of that high office, both from the educational and business standpoint.

He was a graduate of Cornell University where he received his A. B. degree. He had served with his father in the

building of a great business in which he was eminently successful. He was devoted to the people of his district. He loved constitutional government in its highest form, and his every thought was to serve his district, his State, and his Nation efficiently and well.

A fine public servant has departed with the resulting loss to his district and to his Nation. This House will miss him, and those of us who had the honor of being closely united in friendship will miss him greatly.

In this greatest of deliberative bodies, neither invective, sarcasm, nor partisanship can sever the bonds of real friendship.

With the poet we join:

There is no friend like an old friend
Who has shared our morning days;
No greeting like his welcome,
No homage like his praise.

Fame is the scentless sunflower
With gaudy crown of gold,
But friendship is the breathing rose
With sweets in every fold.

We all join today in sorrow over Fred's untimely death and our hearts extend our utmost sympathy to his widow and relatives in their hour of bereavement.

While Fred is gone, his memory will linger with us like the aroma of beautiful flowers as long as life lasts.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for anyone to repeat what has been said here by my colleagues from Michigan showing the value of the service rendered his district, State and Nation by our friend. There is only one note which I wish to add, and that is a personal one.

At the Republican State convention in 1938 Mr. BRADLEY introduced himself to me as a candidate for Congress from the Eleventh District, and wondered whether any of the Republicans who were in Congress would assist him. I told him I knew of one. He said he would call for me in Allegan. His home was near the northeastern end of the southern peninsula, mine in the southwest corner. He was doing his campaigning by auto and plane. I spent some 15 days in his district during that campaign.

If you will draw a line across the State, cutting off the upper third of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, you have that section of his district. A line running east and west, cutting the northern peninsula in two, extending some four or five hundred miles east and west, taking the southern half, will give you that section of his district, the easternmost point being as far east as Toledo Ohio, while the western end is west of St. Louis, so you know something of the difficulties of campaigning in that district. Fred campaigned by plane and by auto, in fair weather and foul. We traveled from one end of the district to the other, sometimes by plane, and when forced down, then four or five hundred miles at a time by auto. Later, in a subsequent campaign, it was my privilege to be in that district for something like 10 days. It was hard, tiresome, uncomfortable work, and the days were long and the nights short.

You ask, What is the point of all this? The point is this, that during that 25 days, in the two campaigns, difficult as it was, tiresome as it was, and the weather was bad, there was never an hour when Fred was not looking first after my comfort, wanting to know and asking whether I was all right. He was not thinking of himself, of his own interests, but of the welfare of those around him. That was typical of his attitude during all the time I have known him, always thinking not of himself but of his friends and of what he could do for them. That characteristic is the thing that made him true and lasting friends. That is a quality that I think we might all keep in mind in our relationships with others. So today, putting aside this thought of the service he rendered to the country—and that was a great service—the thing that is first in my mind and heart is the way in which he always was so thoughtful of others, so solicitous of the welfare of all with whom he came in contact.

All who knew him wish him "good hunting" in the land to which he has gone.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again we are forcefully reminded that the sands of life run swiftly; we know not when the silver cord will be loosed, the golden bowl be broken.

Our colleague, FRED BRADLEY, was one of the four youngest members of the Michigan delegation. He was the first of that membership of 17 to answer the last summons during my service in the Congress. This thought made even more poignant the shock when on Saturday last I heard of his passing on.

Apparently robust and in the full vigor of manhood, he had well begun his work as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. For this task he was eminently fitted—he was a natural. In it he worked for the joy of working and took to his job with a zest and zeal that was an inspiration as well as a great service to the Congress and his country. The few months in his new responsibility gave promise and were an earnest and of a long and outstanding leadership in these difficult times. But the Master of all good workmen had other plans. He took FRED BRADLEY unto Himself.

The country has lost an outstanding public servant. Michigan has lost a great citizen and we have lost a valued friend. His beloved wife, his friends, and his constituents have our deepest sympathy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that we learned of the sudden passing of our colleague, FRED BRADLEY, of the Eleventh Michigan District. Those of us who were privileged to have his friendship will feel his loss very keenly. Fred was a keen student of public affairs and an able legislator. He was always fearless and forthright in the position he took on legislative issues and fought vigor-

ously to uphold his convictions. His superb sense of loyalty to his country and to the people of his own congressional district helped to mitigate against his health. He worked long and assiduously to perform to the fullest extent all of his congressional duties. The chairmanship of the important Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which he assumed at the beginning of this Congress, added further to his burdens and responsibility, and I fear, contributed further to his ill health.

To Mrs. Bradley, his widow, and a very fine lady, we all extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the sad and shocking news of the premature passing of our distinguished colleague, FRED BRADLEY, brings to mind the friendly warning of but a fortnight ago when I pleaded with him to reduce his burdensome schedule of official duties which visibly was sapping his energy and health.

But FRED BRADLEY was not the kind to spare himself, to shirk responsibility, or lay down in harness. He had a duty to perform even at the risk or expense of life itself.

It is perfectly understandable how great was the load which crushed his rugged, manly frame and stilled the noble heart which with the two-fold purpose beat so friendly and warm for his fellow man and propelled him ever onward in the service of his constituency.

The lamentable passing of our colleague in the prime of life should serve to caution those of us left behind that danger lies ahead, and only the Lord knows who shall next be called before His throne. Watch and pray and take care meanwhile that you do not undertake to carry, at accelerated pace, a burden too great for your frail frame. That would be the advice of our departed friend and colleague.

May God rest his weary and deserving soul as He lends strength and consolation to his devoted wife and loved ones. We who have known him hold dear the precious equity of friendship and sorrow made easier to bear by the thought that our parting is but temporary and part of God's own plan and that someday we shall all meet again in Heaven.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was only within the last several months that I came to know FRED BRADLEY and in any wise have any friendship with him. He impressed me as one of the sturdy type. He impressed me as one who probably came from a long line of the sturdy type—I might say the fighting type of American citizen. Knowing him as I did, of course, my grief is not at all small, especially when one in the very prime and vigor of his life, when the career he had hoped for was opening before him. It is my prediction that had Mr. BRADLEY lived he would have made one of the outstanding chairmen of the committees of the present Congress.

To his family and the people of his district who I know must have been deeply personally devoted to him, I extend my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was with our late colleague and friend, FRED BRADLEY, on his last congressional assignment as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.

He had had a busy day going over the various problems in connection with the work of the academy and was about to leave for a week's rest in his home State of Michigan when death came suddenly.

It had been my great pleasure to serve actively with FRED BRADLEY on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which he was chairman, for the past 7 years. FRED BRADLEY had a keen interest in everything maritime. He was a great advocate of making the American merchant marine paramount on the high seas. All of his energies and efforts were centered in that direction. It was his hope that America would maintain that supremacy in the years to come.

He had a great love for his home State, and particularly the Great Lakes region. As a member of the Merchant Marine Committee, and later as chairman, he was responsible for the focusing of attention on this great area as a vital part of our great shipping operations. His determination and persistence were responsible for legislation that was not only beneficial to his own region but to the entire Nation as well.

He performed his duties as chairman with a high degree of fairness. Never have I known the element of partisanship to enter into the deliberations and discussions of our meetings. He was always determined to do only those things which would be in the best interests of the American merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, I personally have lost a true and valued friend. The country, and the American merchant marine in particular, have lost an able and devoted public servant.

I join with my colleagues in extending to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the House is saddened by the death of our late friend, FRED BRADLEY. Many great figures in the history of our country have come and gone as Members of this great body, and they have all left their imprint upon the legislative pages of this body and of our country. FRED BRADLEY, during his term of service in this body, served the people of his district, his State, and our country with devotion, and with seriousness. He has left his marked imprint upon the legislative pages of this great body.

We shall all miss him, those who knew him personally as well as those who knew him officially.

A serious mind, a pleasant personality, his leaving creates a gap that will be hard

to fill. His unfortunate death has made a deep impression upon all his colleagues without regard to party. We all grieve his passing.

As chairman of the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during this session of Congress FRED BRADLEY gave evidence of the great capacity he possessed as a legislator and was giving to that committee, to the House, and to the Congress the character of leadership so necessary in these trying days.

To his widow I join with the many friends of our late colleague in expressing my sympathy.

To the people of his district and to the State of Michigan and to the Michigan delegation in the House I join with my other colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow on the passing of this fine character, this outstanding legislator.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. COFFIN].

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the newer Members of this Congress, I join with my colleagues and especially with the Members of the Michigan delegation in paying a tribute of love and respect to the memory of our friend, FRED BRADLEY.

The sentiments expressed on the floor of this House today give evidence of the high respect and regard in which he was held by the membership generally on both sides of the House. The statements that have been made here today by the members of his committee, over which he has served with such distinction as chairman during this first session of the Eightieth Congress have been particularly impressive. FRED BRADLEY on many occasions has gone out of his way to be helpful to me as a freshman Member of this Congress. On numerous occasions when I have gone to him with a request for advice and counsel with regard to matters which were being handled by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I have been deeply impressed with his thorough and complete knowledge of every problem that was before his committee for consideration. In almost every instance he knew the answer to the question which brought me to his office. If he did not know the answer, he never would permit me to depart from his office until he had secured from others the information I was seeking. His consecration and devotion to the responsibility of his high office as chairman of this committee were both amazing and inspiring and his intelligence with reference to all matters affecting the problems of our merchant marine and fisheries was amazing to me. Although it has been my privilege to know FRED BRADLEY for only a few months, I pay to his memory today the debt of gratitude that I often tried so inadequately to express to him in our many contacts in his office. My thoughts go out particularly at this hour to the wife who even in her grief at his passing must find comfort in the loyalty of FRED BRADLEY's devotion to the interests of his country and in the great service which he has been permitted to render in the work of this present Congress.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD].

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked to learn of the all too untimely death of our colleague, FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan. I came to know him well and regarded him as one of the leaders in Congress. At a later and more appropriate time I will address the membership of this body in tribute to my departed friend.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, again the House is called upon to perform a melancholy task. FRED BRADLEY, whose memory we shall long cherish, had many splendid attributes, the most outstanding of which were his fearlessness and devotion to the welfare of our country. He occupied, as has been stated by previous speakers, a very important position in this organization, and he was admirably equipped for the work that lay ahead of him. Unfortunately, FRED BRADLEY took little heed of his own personal welfare and comfort. He utterly disregarded the precept of that old Chinese philosopher who said: "Relax, it is later than you think."

FRED BRADLEY gave a full measure of his strength and of his ability to his country, to his State, and to his district. I need not say that we shall all miss him. To his devoted wife we give our sympathy and words of comfort. We truly grieve with her in the great loss she has sustained.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and grieved to learn of the sudden and untimely death of FRED BRADLEY, my friend and colleague from Michigan.

Today, first of all, we want to extend our deepest heartfelt sympathies to his good wife and companion, and to the members of his family. We join her in mourning in this hour of sorrow, and pray that God may give her courage and strength to bear her burden.

Although FRED BRADLEY was a Republican and belonged to his party organization, he was never a narrow partisan. Democrats and Republicans alike honored, respected, and loved him.

He was a leader, and an energetic, hard-working legislator who was painstaking, thorough, and dependable and took a broad national view of his responsibilities as a Member of Congress. His country's welfare came first in the discharge of his duties in Congress, and he was faithful to the trust that the people of Michigan reposed in him. He served them impartially and to the utmost of his unusual ability.

He was a good friend to all of us. This is why he enjoyed the respect and esteem of the whole Michigan delegation, regardless of party, and I know that this is the feeling of the entire membership of the House of Representatives. He was a man of great character and pleasant

disposition a great American and a true Christian.

FRED BRADLEY represented the Eleventh Congressional District of Michigan. This is the northern part of the State, often referred to as God's country, the vacationers' paradise. This district borders on three of the Great Lakes—Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, and Lake Huron. This is the land of greatness—great trees, great forests, great lakes, ocean-sized vessels, great fishing, great hunting, plenty of deer, bear, and game of all kinds. Some great blizzards and great storms, too. Here you see Nature in all its splendor and glory. Here you also see Nature as rough and tough, powerful and dynamic.

FRED BRADLEY was truly a part of his district. He not only represented it; he lived it, he reflected its every mood and season. He was part of the great north country. He was truly a man from northern Michigan. A pleasant disposition, generous and kindly, soft and considerate of others; yet a man with unlimited energy, great driving power, and physical strength.

He loved to work hard. He did not know what it was to rest and take it easy. He loved ships and the great waters of northern Michigan. He loved to fish and hunt. He loved the great outdoors, his dog, the woods, the streams. He loved all of nature and its wonders. He loved his district and its people. The people loved him and elected him again and again.

In his passing we have lost a friend and a worthy and able colleague; the State of Michigan and the Nation have lost a loyal and devoted citizen and public servant. His colleagues, the Congress, his State, and his country will miss him.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked late Saturday evening to hear over the radio of the death of our good friend and colleague, FRED BRADLEY. I was shocked because at 2 o'clock in the afternoon I shook hands with him on the steps of the administration building at the United States Coast Guard Academy, in New London, Conn., and bid him a good vacation. Fred had planned that instead of returning to Washington with the Board of Visitors he would go to New York and there board a train and go to Michigan for a week's rest.

I well recall my last words to him. In a jesting mood I said: "It is very nice of you fellows"—I was referring to the members of the Board of Visitors who were not flying back with us—"to see us off and to you, Fred," and I extended my hand, "let us hope your vacation is a good one because you need it."

Fred was a man of rather gruff appearance, but within that breast of his was a heart of gold. He thought not of himself but of others. While we were of opposite political parties we were the closest friends. I mourn his answer to the last roll call.

To his wife, to his family, to the people of his district I extend my sympathy and, to you, let me say that this country is better because FRED BRADLEY has lived.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member it has been my privilege to know FRED BRADLEY only a short time in comparison with many of you, but due to the fact that we have the same name, to the probability that we were distantly related, to our similarity of interests in ships and shipping, and to my membership on the committee of which he was chairman, I have been in close contact with him and have learned to appreciate his rugged virtues and his sterling honesty.

Fred and I have traveled together; we have addressed the same meetings; we have tried to solve the same problems, some of the most difficult which confront the Nation in matters pertaining to the sea.

Fred loved his country, his State, his home, his family, his friends, and his ships—whether those ships sailed the oceans of the world or the inland seas we call the Great Lakes. He met life boldly even as a stanch ship meets the waters of a turbulent ocean. He basked in the sunshine of good weather. He smiled and fought on when the going was tough.

I shall sorely miss FRED BRADLEY, the gentleman from Michigan, the friend of fishermen, of seamen, of canal workers, of wildlife conservationists, of the industrialists who make jobs possible, and of every true American.

May we who go on in life struggling against the obstacles of injustice, poverty, and oppression keep the thought of this departed friend ever green in our memories so that we may better serve America—the land which God has allotted to our safekeeping.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, after years of service, which was always too strenuous, it can now truthfully be said that FRED BRADLEY has yielded up to his country the last full measure of devotion. It has been frequently said in the last few minutes, and with great truth, that he always worked too hard; that he cared more for others; that he paid more attention to his duties to his country than he did for himself; and that I know particularly well because in the last few days I was with him a great deal of the time. He spoke in New York on Wednesday evening on matters of consequence to the merchant marine of this country. He came back and spoke again in Washington Thursday evening on the same subject. He left early Friday with the Board of Visitors for New London, Conn., and spent two strenuous days there, and it can be said that up until the very minute of his death, almost, because his death was very sudden, he was engaged in a strenuous and patriotic and selfless service to his country.

I might say of him as the chairman of his committee, which I have the privilege of being a member, that nowhere was his selflessness and his self-effacing more apparent. He was doing a grand

job on that committee, and one of the reasons why he did is because he gave to all the membership duties to perform, and he effaced himself. That virtue was no more freely characterized than on this last trip that we took with him to New London. He was a grand man, an unselfish man, a distinguished chairman, and a great American, and his death leaves the House and the Nation much poorer.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on becoming a Member of the House of Representatives, I was assigned to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. There I met the friend whom we mourn today. Those were the trying days of the approach of war. During the war that committee had a dual service to perform with the Committee on Naval Affairs and the other great committees that handled the legislation authorizing the effort that we put forth for that great struggle. Among the membership of that committee was FRED BRADLEY. He was faithful. He was attentive. He was always present, and as the war progressed and as controversial legislation came before the committee, FRED BRADLEY was fair. FRED BRADLEY was just in the charges that arose in the consideration of the committee. He lent his effort and his strength to the then chairman of the committee, who was having a difficult time. Because of his fairness, his kindness, and his justice in his associations with the other members of the committee, I became very much attached to him. As the years went on, I had the pleasure of accompanying him on missions for the committee. There I learned to know him better; there I learned to admire him more. I can truthfully say he was a fair, square shooter and an earnest, hard worker for the welfare and the progress not only of Congress and the Nation but all those with whom he came in contact. I learned to admire him highly and to enjoy his company. I was delighted when he became chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee. As chairman, he never disappointed me. I approved his leadership. Saturday, when I heard the sad news of his passing, my wife and I both bowed our heads, because we had had jointly the pleasure of knowing him and his fine wife and being associated with them on many occasions. I shall miss Fred as you will miss him. We will miss him as the folks back home will miss him. God take care of his soul and rest his spirit.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I came to know FRED BRADLEY when I was appointed to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Fred was a very stern man, a very firm man, when he needed to be, but beneath his hard outward crust there beat a very warm heart. He was always very kind with all of his friends. He was always eminently fair. There was not a witness who appeared before the committee who did not feel that he got a fair break before FRED BRADLEY.

We who are members of that committee were not particularly shocked at his passing, because we rather expected it. We knew the way he was driving himself and the fits of coughing he had which were an outward sign of his heart condition. Many of us on the committee commented that we wished Fred would take it easy, that we were afraid for his health. What we feared has come to pass. He knew that he was sick. He knew that he should not have gone to the Panama Canal with the committee, but he did. He had been there before, and there was no real occasion for his so endangering himself. He came with the Board of Visitors to the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy just a week ago. I was on that Board. He was a pretty sick man then. He could not climb the stairs, but he did show up at the Academy.

He knew ships. His father before him had been a merchant mariner, and he carried on in a great tradition. There was nothing about ships that he did not know or could not understand. He really knew his subject.

I know it is a great loss to his wife, to his State, and to his constituents that Fred is gone. They will miss him, and we will miss him, too.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in times like these, when the Grim Reaper has come within our midst and has claimed the life of one of our loved ones, we do not find words to express the feelings that are in our hearts. FRED BRADLEY is gone, and in his passing the people of the Eleventh District of Michigan and the people of this country have lost a great American. To his lovely and devoted wife, Marie, we join in expressing our deepest sympathy.

FRED BRADLEY and I came to Congress at the same time. We were part of that large group which came here with the Seventy-sixth Congress. Almost from that first day there grew up between his family and mine a real and lasting friendship. I had the pleasure of visiting Fred in his home up around the Straits of Michigan and came to know something of the esteem and admiration with which those fine people looked at Fred as their Member of Congress.

In times like these it is difficult to understand the whys of all this. In fact, we cannot understand. It is for us but to believe and to hold fast to our belief in immortality and to the faith that we will see our friend Fred again in another world.

That belief that was best expressed by the poet who wrote:

Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine through his cypress trees!
Who, hopeless, lays his dead away,
Nor looks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play!
Who hath not learned, in hours of faith,
The truth to flesh and sense unknown,
That life is ever lord of death,
And love can never lose its own!

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, as was stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT], who just addressed the Chamber, FRED BRADLEY came to Congress in the class of seventy-six, of which both Mr. GRANT and I were also Members.

Due to the fact that almost every Wednesday night that Congress has been in session since that time the Republican Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress have met around the dinner table and discussed matters of public business and listened to speeches on public affairs, there has grown up a very close special attachment among the members of what we call the Seventy-six Club. Among the members of that group FRED BRADLEY was very prominent and very highly respected. He was a very loyal attendant at those meetings.

Those of us who came to know him so well through these weekly occasions recognized early that FRED BRADLEY was as forthright as he was friendly. He was a man of very strong likes and dislikes. Anybody who knew FRED BRADLEY at all always knew where FRED BRADLEY stood. He disliked anything shoddy. He disliked anything un-American. He abominated communism. He disliked the chiseler and the short sport. He was always prominent in activities and in legislative matters which would eliminate cheating, bad sportsmanship, and unfairness in any form.

I think it is typical of Fred that he took time from his busy life to introduce legislation to protect homeless dogs in Washington because Fred loved dogs and dogs liked Fred, which is after all a pretty good measure of a man.

Fred was equally emphatic in his likes. He loved America and the people of America, regardless of rank, position, or power. He loved the out of doors. He loved to hear the crack of a gun in the field and he loved to listen to the zing of a fishing reel. He loved to feel the roll of a boat under his feet because he loved nature. He was in truth one of nature's noblemen.

FRED BRADLEY and his charming wife, Marie, are very special friends of Mrs. Mundt and me. We were together many times. I was at his home just last night. While his death came unexpectedly to us, I am sure it did not come unexpectedly to Fred. He had been warned about his heart condition. About a year ago he spent several weeks at naval hospital with the ailment which eventually terminated his career. He was warned to take it easy, to go slow; but typical of Fred he chose the braver and nobler course. He refused to slow down. He refused to take it easy. So Fred went out as he went on, with colors flying, and the signal in the pilot room reading, "full speed ahead."

To his wife, Marie, and the relatives, I extend my greatest sympathy. To the people of Michigan who elected him, I congratulate them on their wisdom in their choice, and commiserate with them in their misery at his passing. The Congress and the country have lost a great man and the merchant marine industry one of its greatest lifetime friends. The ancient writer, Agricola, one time said, "Death comes to all, but great

achievements raise a monument which shall endure until the sun grows cold." The achievements of FRED BRADLEY in his unhappily abbreviated career will long bear living testimony to his rugged personality, his generous spirit, and his great love for America. May his spirit rest in peace.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, we have gathered today to pay tribute to a loyal friend and colleague who died suddenly at New Britain, Conn., while on tour of duty at the Marine College last Saturday, May 24.

Mrs. Gillie and I were profoundly shocked to pick up the Baltimore Sun at the home of our daughter in Baltimore Sunday and to learn of the sudden death of FRED BRADLEY. I have not yet overcome the shock as his death still seems unreal.

FRED BRADLEY and I came to the Congress 9 years ago—the Seventy-sixth Congress. I learned to know him intimately. He was a tireless worker in the House. Later, he became chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, subjects on which he was so well informed. He labored long and enthusiastically to try and help its cause. Fred's father, who was the founder of the Bradley Line on the Great Lakes, gave him the knowledge and foresight for the work he was to carry on in this great committee.

Fred not only worked hard, but he played hard. He loved the great out-of-doors, was a great hunter and fisherman. I have been his guest several times at his lovely cottage on beautiful Grand Lake, Mich. As a host he was a past master, looking after your every want at all times. His guests were given every consideration during their stay.

Fred was one of the organizers and leaders of the Wednesday Evening Club, of which I am a member. It was organized by the Republican Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress, at which top-flight Government men and others spoke on important Government problems.

He was an agreeable companion, loyal and sincere in the discharge of self-assumed obligations and duties. He was a sturdy citizen of the great State of Michigan who has done much for his country and for his constituency of the Eleventh District.

Fred will be remembered for his gentle traits of character which endeared him to his many friends.

And to his lovely wife, Marie—may the precious memories you cherish of your life together and of Fred's unselfish devotion to you and to his country, sustain you now and in the days to come.

The sentiments expressed in the following poem seem to me to bespeak the thoughts that come to my mind at the passing of this fine friend and American:

THE END OF THE ROAD

Tonight we have come to the end of the road, and the way gleams white behind,
With but few dark splotches to mar its course, a few that are hard to find—
But the length of the road gleams white, my friend, for the journey was well run,
And we come to the end with a brief regret, that at last the task is done.

There was joy in seeking the distant goal,
Whatever the odds between,
There was faith in surmounting the higher hill, with a vision to be seen;
Thus we laughed as we battled them, one by one, for we knew we could not fail,
And we gloried in sighting a farther one, close by the end of the trail.

Here's a sigh for the vales and pleasant dales,
For the streams that gilded through,
Here's a sigh for the friends whom we met en route and a hope that they win out, too.

To the end of the road with a course well run,
What epitaph more could say?
That we held to the faith as we journeyed through and smiled as we won our way?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, while I had occasion to know FRED BRADLEY only casually during my first 4 years in the Congress, it was only in the early part of this term that I came to know him well, having been with him every day for 2 weeks on a Merchant Marine Committee investigation trip to the Panama Canal.

Some of us take a longer time to really know a man, but I learned in that time to know FRED BRADLEY. Some of us do not know a man until we see him "carry the ball."

As chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee charged with the supervision of the Panama Canal FRED BRADLEY recognized fully the responsibilities of his committee with respect to this most important and strategic holding of our Government with its huge financial investment, and since under the reorganization of the Congress there were many new members of the Merchant Marine Committee, Mr. BRADLEY decided that it was not only necessary for the new members of the committee to visit Panama, but also the other members of the committee who had not been there, in order that they might see first hand the immensity of the agency they were charged to supervise, but also to make an investigation as to whether or not the Canal Zone was properly and economically administered.

Changes and improvements in the Canal Zone were being proposed and FRED BRADLEY insisted that his committee visit Panama to make an investigation, not only in this regard, but from every angle. He was that way about everything. He had to be convinced.

Mr. Speaker, FRED BRADLEY was a courageous man. He was a man of high character, a patriotic American, a fearless leader, yet most considerate and tolerant toward others. He was charitable, yet exacting.

Our country has lost an able and valuable Member of the Congress, and we in the House have lost a fine colleague.

I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy and condolence to Mrs. Bradley. As Shakespeare said:

That strain again; it had a dying fall;
Oh! it came o'er my ear like the sweet South,
That breathes upon a bank of violets,
Stealing and giving odor.

Mr. Speaker, we can well use the words of Halleck in our farewell to FRED BRADLEY:

Green be the turf above thee,
Friend of our better days;
None knew thee but to love thee
Nor named thee but to praise.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a valuable Member, a great American, and a good friend to all of us. I have been an admirer of FRED BRADLEY for many years. He was a fraternity brother of mine. He belonged to the Delta Chi of Cornell University. I followed his career for many years while he was at Cornell. He was one of the most popular men who ever entered the university. He had a fine influence on those with whom he associated. There are literally thousands of Cornell men and women today who will mourn the death of FRED BRADLEY.

He had all the qualities of a fine sailor; he had all the bravery and the courage of a real navigator. He knew that the ship which his spirit occupied was hardly able to weather the storm of this great forum, but he carried on like a true sailor, headed into the storm and carried through to the end. Let us, his friends here mourning and bidding him goodbye, realize that as he sailed out on the high seas for another world and disappeared over the horizon, let us have faith that on the shore of that other world stand many friends waiting to welcome him to his final home.

I sympathize deeply with his wife. He had a happy domestic life.

The friends and loved ones he leaves behind can well be proud of the fine record he has made here in Congress. He has really made a great contribution to the welfare of his country.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to come to the House in the same Congress with FRED BRADLEY. Throughout the years I found him to be a friend such as Marc Antony had in Caesar: He was my friend, faithful and just to me.

To give you some idea of the typical energy of FRED BRADLEY's make-up let me recall that one evening about 12 midnight Fred called me and asked me to go with him on a sojourn which would have taken us a hundred miles into Virginia to attend an international conference, because he felt that it was the duty of Members of Congress to be present at this particular gathering to look after the interests of America.

FRED BRADLEY was a great American. He was a patriotic citizen. He served his district well in Congress.

When one of our associates passes away or when someone close to us leaves us we are wont to associate the incident with the words of the bard of Avon—I think this applies particularly to our departed colleague in our sentiment and feeling toward him:

For it so falls out

That what we have we prize not to its worth
Whiles we enjoy it, but being lack'd and lost,
Why, then we rack the value; then we find
The virtue that possession would not show us
Whiles it was ours.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the death of FRED BRADLEY hit me mighty hard. I am another of those who came here with him in the Seventy-sixth Congress. We always felt that the Spirit of '76 dominated us and were an independent crowd. Fred was certainly independent. I am another of the members of the Wednesday Night Club that Fred attended so regularly. I have been in his home, I have flown with him in his airplane. He was a great-hearted friend and I shall miss him. I know how his fine wife, Marie, is going to miss him. My heart goes out to her, and to all his family, for I shall miss him, too.

I know how the people of his district will miss him, because FRED BRADLEY put his district on the map with me as few other Congressmen have. Many of you remember the smelt festival that he gave here when he entertained the whole House one evening down in the dining room and conducted some championship contests and had the Queen of Smeltania there and made everybody realize what a great district he had.

He was a valuable man on the House floor and in committee; he was a valuable man to his country.

But what I thought about Fred most is that he exemplified this word we speak of so often—self sacrifice. He believed in sacrificing himself. He realized that time cannot be saved; it can only be spent.

Mr. Speaker, I never knew a man who drove himself as hard as FRED BRADLEY; I never knew a man who looked so stern yet was so gentle; I never knew a man who tried so to give the appearance of being hard, yet once you had any contacts with him you realized that he was soft-hearted, great-hearted, gentle and generous.

At a time like this we all think about immortality. I am thinking of Fred now. He is not dead. FRED BRADLEY was too tough to kill, he was too fine to die. He had a spirit that will never die and while he is not here now physically, he is around us spiritually, he is living and will live in our hearts and in our memories, forever. His is the kind of indomitable spirit that does not die.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our very dear friend and colleague, FRED BRADLEY, brings great sorrow to our hearts.

Over the past several years I learned to know him and admire him greatly. He was a cheerful, friendly fellow who delighted when any acts or deeds of his brought happiness to the rest of us.

His devotion to and love of country was something to be admired. He was earnest and sincere, and always ambitious to uphold and defend the fine ideals and traditions of our Nation.

We are all mindful of the great service he has rendered and his devotion to the best and finest things in life.

He strove mightily to attain those objectives which he thought were for the best interests of all our people. In his daily life he manifested a fine spirit of good fellowship that we all so greatly enjoyed.

His work here in the Congress was outstanding and will be long remembered.

May God give to his wife and family great comfort and consolation at this time. We pay him this last tribute and bid him this last farewell.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and the keenest sense of personal loss I learned of the passing of our friend and beloved colleague from Michigan, FRED BRADLEY.

It was my good fortune to become intimately acquainted with Fred shortly after we were elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress, almost 9 years ago. During that time I not only came to admire and respect him as a fine patriotic, conscientious public servant, but will always cherish the memory of him as one of my best and truest friends.

Everyone takes pride in a man who thinks straight, says what he thinks, and votes the way he talks. Such a man was FRED BRADLEY. He fought for what he believed was right, and he believed in those basic principles of American freedom which have made this country great. He had unbounded courage to publicly state his convictions. He stood steadfast by those convictions first, last and all the time.

No one was better qualified by experience and background to be chairman of the important Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. With his wide business experience in shipping, his boundless energy to acquaint himself with every detail of his burdensome task, he literally worked himself to death. He died just as much for his country as if he had been killed in battle.

There are few indeed in public office who will sacrifice not only their lives but spend considerable of their own personal fortunes in serving their constituency. FRED did exactly that.

To those of us who knew Fred best, it was not his statesmanlike ability to carry out his official work far beyond the call of duty that we admired, but his kindness, his generosity, and devotion to his family and friends.

Fred loved the Northland—its forests, lakes, and streams. He thoroughly enjoyed hunting, fishing, and other sports which it so abundantly affords. He had a kindly affection for all dumb animals and was especially devoted to his faithful dog Curly who lies buried there.

Fred is going home to the country he loved. Not only his constituency and his State, but the Nation will mourn his passing.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to what has already been said about the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan.

Along with the rest of you, I join in extending my heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved widow, one of the most elegant ladies who ever graced the Nation's Capital.

Someone has referred to the friendships that spring up between members of the different political parties in this House as the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

FRED BRADLEY was one of the best friends I had in this body; and I valued that friendship beyond measure.

My love and admiration for him sprang from the fact that he was a great American whose loyalty and devotion to his country rose high about the scramble for party vantage or the noisy clamor of men for place and power.

He possessed that rare quality which Vice President Garner said was so badly needed in both Houses of Congress, and that is moral courage. He had the courage to vote his convictions and to stand for what he thought was to the best interest of his country. If we had more men with the courage and patriotism of FRED BRADLEY in both Houses of Congress, and in every department of this Government, communism would not dare raise its loathsome head in our midst, and our Nation would soon be relieved of the menace of the enemies within our gates.

I cannot realize that he is gone. It seems but yesterday that I had a long conversation with him in the rear of the Chamber on the activities of the Communist menace in this country. I did not know then that he was leaving on his last voyage; or taking his final flight in his attempts to strengthen our country from within.

If I had, I would have said to him:

May those winged winds that round your pathway roar
Waft you to some favored spot, where mortals weep no more.
Or may the rolling of the mighty deep, whose billows round you play
Bear you to some sacred place, some haven far away,
Where the weary soul may find the bliss for which it sighs,
Where sorrow never lives and friendship never dies.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, today we have assembled to pay our last tribute to one of our fellow workers who has passed into the great beyond—FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan.

We entered Congress at the same time, on January 3, 1939. We were first sworn in together to serve in this great law-making body. We became warm friends upon entering Congress, and this fine friendship has continued, without abatement, until he was called into the Great Beyond on last Saturday. Now, that friendship is but a treasured memory—which will long endure. FRED BRADLEY was a loyal friend, a kindly neighbor, and an outstanding statesman. He was fearless and he was brave—yet, with it all, he was kind and he was generous to all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the imprint which FRED BRADLEY has left with me—which will long remain—was his tremendous and unabated loyalty to his country, to our people, and to our Constitution. In all of his activities in Congress, his sturdy loyalty

to our Nation, to all of the people, and to our form of government was ever apparent. He ever asserted strength in his likes and his dislikes, and as he meditated thus he spoke. He was an arch-enemy of communism and of every form of un-Americanism; he firmly believed in combating every doctrine which was subversive in whole or in part, or which was in any manner inimical to a 100 percent Americanism. He loved the people of his great State of Michigan. The people were his friends and he was their friend. It was there and among them that he enjoyed the pleasures of youth, there he attended the institutions of learning, and there, too, he met and conquered the privations and hardships which he confronted; thus, he became deep-rooted in his great affection for all of those about him. The people of his district, and of his State, quickly learned that he was a staunch and loyal friend in whom they could repose the choicest ideals of life. He never betrayed their confidence. He was sincere, and he was honorable, in all of the activities of life.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, whose memory I will long cherish, lived as he died—and he died as he lived—with the weight of the vivid problems of the people before him. He was at his post of duty when the silent summons came. He was unafraid. He responded to that summons—just as he had responded to every call during life.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the life work of FRED BRADLEY was ended. The brilliant career of our kindly friend was thus terminated.

FRED BRADLEY needs no encomium. His life and his living of it stand before us as his monument.

We can but say:

Away. We know that tears are vain,
That death nor heeds nor hears distress;
Will this unteach us to complain?
Or make one mourner weep the less?
And thou, who tellst me to forget,
Thy looks are wan, thine eyes are wet.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I, with every other friend of the late Honorable FRED BRADLEY, was shocked to hear of his sudden passing on Saturday last.

When Fred first came to Congress he became a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We were closely associated in the work of that committee until I assumed my present duties as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, when it became necessary for me to surrender my membership with him on the Merchant Marine Committee.

To know Congressman BRADLEY was to have a deep affection for him. His sincerity of purpose and devotion to the American Merchant Marine were surpassed by no Member of Congress within my memory. His early training and environment based upon his family's maritime interests gave him the opportunity to early know the problems of the American merchant marine. He used this knowledge for its constructive development as both an arm of our peace-time economy and our wartime national defense. His sudden passing leaves a void at one of the most crucial periods in

the history of the American merchant marine. The Nation, the State of Michigan, his congressional district, and his family have suffered a great loss.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, one of our Ohio colleagues, Mr. JOHN VORYS, evidently had in mind that the late Dr. Washington Gladden, author of the hymn, *Oh Master Let Me Walk With Thee*, was thinking of such men as our colleague, FRED BRADLEY, when he stated, "Life is to be spent, not saved."

FRED BRADLEY truly spent his life in behalf of his country and others. Again and again FRED BRADLEY had been told by those of professional skill to take it easy, to relax, and to save himself. Yes; he had been warned not to go to Panama and New London, but Fred thought not of saving himself but spent everything he had, knowing that he had the skill that would save his country and could do so more constructively in regard to the merchant marine, its activities, and our shores and lakes as well.

"He who gives his life shall find it," and today FRED BRADLEY is finding abundant life because he just gave it. Like most Members of Congress, FRED BRADLEY was a hypocrite in reverse. On the outside he pretended nothing, he gave the impression of one with a rough exterior, but the inner self of FRED BRADLEY meant, "I give all for my Lord and my country."

Most of us do not know who will be the next President and it does not matter much when all is said. None of us know the outcome of some issues about which there is so much strain, nor should we care. The only thing that should concern us is that we live like FRED BRADLEY, pretending nothing, trying to impress nobody, but giving our all.

Therefore, from the life of FRED BRADLEY and others, there is one thing we know, "There is no death." What is called death is a misnomer and in passing on, FRED BRADLEY will not enter a blind alley but a thoroughfare, and a real thoroughfare to eternal happiness which he has earned.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, according to our modern standards, FRED BRADLEY did not live long, but he lived much. In his 49 years he lived harder and accomplished more than most men at the age of threescore years and ten.

He had not passed on life's highway the stone that marks the highest point, but being weary for a moment he lay down by the wayside and, using his burden for a pillow, fell into that dreamless sleep that kisses down his eyelids still. While in love with life and enraptured with the world, he passed to silent and pathetic dust. Yet it may be best, just in the happiest, sunniest hour of all the voyage, while eager winds are kissing every sail, to dash against the unseen rock, and in an instant hear the billows roar above a sunken ship. For whether in midsea or among the breakers on the farther shore, a wreck at last must mark the end of each and all.

FRED BRADLEY, who loved ships so well, has sailed his last voyage on this earth and has launched upon that journey from which no traveler returns. He lived intensely and he died gamely. He was a true apostle of the strenuous life. He bubbled over with energy and drove

himself hard—those around him also had to move.

If he had desired, FRED BRADLEY could have lived a life of ease and comfort, but there was nothing soft about him. He deliberately chose the hard road of unselfish service to his district, his State, and Nation. His greatest satisfaction came to him after a hard job well done. After graduating from Cornell University, he became a salesman for his father's firm, which quarried limestone in northern Michigan and engaged in shipping on the Great Lakes. He met all kinds of people in this varied industry and developed resourcefulness and strength through keen competition. He could become theoretical, but always remained practical.

Shortly after his election to the Seventy-sixth Congress in 1938, I became acquainted with Fred and during the years we have served together in Congress I came to know him well. I learned not merely to respect him but a bond of affection grew up between us. He was not always easily understood, and it required time for anyone to break through certain barriers to discover the real person he was. Because of his strong convictions there were times when he appeared hard, but beneath his bold exterior and back of his startling candor there was a big and kind heart, and an absolute and uncompromising honesty.

FRED BRADLEY was a formidable opponent and on any level and under any circumstances he was worthy of any man's steel. I never saw a more fearless individual. He possessed great physical and moral courage. There was plenty of Irish in Fred. For him an ideal or a principle was to be not only accepted intellectually but defended with his whole being.

The things about Fred we will always remember and can never forget were his human qualities. He was a true sportsman. Every type and form of athletics interested him, particularly baseball, football, and boxing—provided each sport was clean. He wanted the game to be played according to the rules and frowned upon cheating or taking undue advantage. He loved the great outdoors and enjoyed fishing, hunting, and boating as much as an adolescent youth. He loved the woods and the sea, good food, and rich fellowship.

Many of us enjoyed delightful trips with him in his boat on the Potomac. We have been the recipients of the gracious and generous hospitality of him and his dear wife in their lovely home. We shall cherish the memories of the good times we have spent in his home and ours; in his office and ours. On the trips we have taken together and in the quiet conversations we have had alone, we learned to know his big heart, his kind soul, and generous spirit. No one could ever love animals, especially dogs, as much as FRED BRADLEY did, and be mean to any human being. He loved children, and his interest in disabled veterans was genuine and touching. It afforded him much pleasure to bring the injured from Walter Reed Hospital into his own home and even to give some employment. He always seemed to be thinking of new ways

to help somebody. He spent much of his salary on long-distance calls from Washington to Michigan trying to help some constituent in even a minor matter.

Because of his inherited interest in ships and his practical experience with them, he served, since coming to Congress, on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. At the beginning of this Congress he was elevated to the chairmanship of this important and powerful committee. It was the fulfillment of a keen ambition and he devoted every ounce of his energy—which seemed to be boundless—to the job.

After visiting two of the hearings of his committee this session, I was impressed with the efficient manner in which he conducted its hearings, but was disturbed over his physical condition because anyone could plainly see that he was literally burning himself up. Only a short time ago I pleaded with him to take things more easily and to try to get some rest because we all knew, and so did he, that he spent several weeks during the last session in the naval hospital.

In addition to his arduous work in committee and on the floor of the House, he personally answered voluminous correspondence and prepared a weekly broadcast to the people of his district. The trips of inspection and investigation, coupled with innumerable interviews, finally broke his resolute will, his determined spirit, and rugged physique. His stout heart could not carry such a heavy load and last Saturday it ran down and stopped beating. Fred died as he would have chosen—at his post of duty.

Many times Fred would have me quote the following lines by John G. Neihardt:

Let me live out my years in heat of blood.
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine.

Let me not see this soul-house built of mud
Go toppling to the dust—a vacant shrine.

Let me go quickly like a candlelight
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow.
Give me high noon—and let it then be night.
Thus would I go.

And grant me, when I face the grisly thing,
One haughty cry to pierce the gray, perhaps.

Oh, let me be a tune-swept fiddle string,
That feels the master melody—and snaps.

FRED BRADLEY died "in heat of blood" and went "quickly like a candlelight snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow." He had felt the "master melody" and snapped like a "tune-swept fiddle string." He would not change it.

At last FRED BRADLEY has gained rest and peace from his trying and exacting labors and has gone to his reward for having served God and country well.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to know Congressman FRED BRADLEY until I came to Congress this last January. About the first contact I had with him was one day when he called me up and told me the subcommittees to which he had appointed me, stating that I was to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources. This was entirely unexpected but was an opportunity for which I shall always be grateful to him.

I learned to know FRED BRADLEY as a tremendously hard worker, very con-

scientious, and under a brusque manner, a geniality and cordiality of spirit that was delightful. I liked him very much. He thought of others more than he did for himself. He was a great chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and I regret tremendously that he could not be spared to go on and develop this work, as I know he wished to do.

I am sure the Members of the House and of the great committee of which he was chairman will miss his presence. For myself, I feel that I have lost a real new-found friend, and extend my deep sympathy to Mrs. Bradley and other members of his family.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to a great leader and esteemed friend the Honorable FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan, whose sudden passing has come as a great shock to all of us.

In the death of FRED BRADLEY, Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost an able, conscientious, and aggressive leader who never wavered in the defense of his high, patriotic principles. He was hard hitting and hard driving in carrying out his work as a Member of Congress, but he was admired and respected at all times by all who knew him.

He died as he lived, serving his people. His record in Congress should serve as an inspiration and challenge to all of us.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution today adopted by the Michigan delegation:

Whereas the Michigan delegation in the United States House of Representatives has learned with profound sorrow of the untimely passing of our friend and colleague, Hon. FRED BRADLEY; and

Whereas for more than 8 years we have had the wise counsel and inspiration of our colleague, whose every moment gleamed with love of friends and every hour studded thick with jewels of loyalty and service to his State and to his Nation; and

Whereas our Maker has seen fit to call our colleague from our midst, though many milestones were left unpassed on the road of life and ere the setting sun cast its shadows to the east: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in the passing of Hon. FRED BRADLEY the State of Michigan and its Eleventh Congressional District and the Nation itself have lost a true statesman and a faithful servant, and the Michigan delegation in Congress has been deprived of the judgment and ability of a great American and an able legislator; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the Michigan congressional delegation in the Eightieth Congress, do by this means express our deep regret that his career has been brought to a close at a time when his highest ambitions and ideals were being realized; and be it further

Resolved, That, while we feel the ineffectiveness of any act of ours to in any way assuage the grief of his widow, we extend to her our deepest sympathy in this her hour of bereavement.

ROY O. WOODRUFF, EARL C. MICHENER, JESSE P. WOLCOTT, GEORGE A. DONDERO, FRED L. CRAWFORD, ALBERT J. ENGEL, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, PAUL W. SHAFER, WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, BARTEL J. JONKMAN, JOHN B. BENNETT, HOWARD A. COFFIN, HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD, JOHN D. DINGELL, JOHN LESINSKI, GEORGE G. SADOWSKI.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 217), which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 217

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRED BRADLEY, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee Messrs. HOFFMAN, SHAFER, GRANT of Indiana, and DINGELL. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 27, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

710. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

711. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

712. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Articles for the Government of the Navy to improve the administration of naval justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CURTIS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 468. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3309. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; with an amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Washington: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the official reporters of debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1945. A bill to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1946. A bill to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1947. A bill to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 640. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan; without amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3511. A bill to extend the provisions of section 1 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, until June 30, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 218. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 3601, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VORYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:
H. R. 3611. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAMBLE:
H. R. 3612. A bill to amend the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 so as to terminate the authority to allocate or ration refined sugar among users for home consumption; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEAN:
H. R. 3613. A bill to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3614. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Brainerd War Dead National Memorial; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 3615. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1946, entitled "An act to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3616. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3617. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., extending 1 mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Fla., and 2 miles west from said bridge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3618. A bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 3619. A bill relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 3620. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain persons who served in the Polish Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending pension benefits to persons who served on certain transport vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal operation of air-traffic control towers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to providing funds for a continued Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199, granting tax exemptions to those held prisoners by the Japanese; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, S. 866, of the Eightieth Congress, first session; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 3621. A bill for the relief of Flavia Isidora Vieira Sauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3622. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

568. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 163 citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, urging that communism in this country be stopped and stamped out completely; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

569. By Mr. WELCH: Assembly Joint Resolution 37 of the California State Legislature, relative to extending pension benefits to persons who served on certain transport vessels operated by the Army during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

570. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Bar Association of Arkansas, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for an amendment to the Federal Employers' Liability Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

571. Also, petition of the membership of the Tampa Townsend Club, No. 1, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

572. Also, petition of the membership of the Pensacola Townsend Club, No. 1, Pensacola, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

573. Also, petition of American Veterans Committee, Territory of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to restrictions imposed on American citizens of oriental birth who wish to travel from Hawaii to the mainland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

574. Also, petition of Holy Name Society of the Sacred Heart Church, of Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to subversive activities of foreign agents who tend to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

575. Also, petition of the New England Conference of the Methodist Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reaffirming support of the provision in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts which forbids the use of public funds for the maintenance of private and sectarian schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Edward T. Wiatrak, S. J., Jesuit Missions, New York City, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Take, O Lord, and receive all my liberty, my memory, my understanding, and my whole will. Thou hast given me all that I have and all that I possess; I restore it all to Thee and surrender it, that Thou mayest dispose of it according to

Thy will. Give me only Thy love and Thy grace, and I am rich enough and desire nothing more. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 26, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3029) to provide for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199, granting tax exemptions to those held prisoners by the Japanese

"Whereas many citizens of the State of California, civilians and members of our armed forces, were taken and held in Japanese prisons and suffered untold hardships; and

"Whereas it is fitting and proper that the former prisoners of war receive the benefits granted by two bills now pending before the Congress of the United States, H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199, which bills give them certain tax benefits under section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution relative to Federal operation of air-traffic-control towers

"Whereas the House Appropriations Committee has eliminated from the bill providing funds for the support of the Department of Commerce the item appropriating funds for the operation of the air-traffic-control tow-

ers at San Francisco and other municipal airports; and

"Whereas in the interests of public safety these air-traffic-control towers should be operated by personnel employed, instructed, and controlled by one agency, so that air traffic at all airports may have the benefit of standardized uniform control, without which national and international air commerce and the lives of air-line pilots and thousands of passengers will be placed in jeopardy; and

"Whereas, however willing municipalities or other local organizations might be to bear the expense of operating the control towers, they could by no amount of cooperation within their legal powers provide the uniformity essential to such controls, serving as they do on air commerce so extensive that only an agency national in scope can provide the centralization of control and supervision essential to safety; and

"Whereas many cities are now spending millions of dollars in modernizing airports for safety and convenience, the Federal Government should not defeat these programs by withdrawing from them the essential service of a standardized and uniform operation of air-traffic-control towers at these airports: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and petitioned to appropriate moneys which will insure the continued Federal operation of air-control towers at municipal airports; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit immediately copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

The memorial of Mrs. W. H. Rogers, of Fallbrook, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A petition of the members of the Safety Harbor (Fla.) Townsend Club, No. 1, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of John J. Spriggs, of Lander, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to reduce the court costs on appeal in both the circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States to the point where citizens of limited financial means can exercise the right of appeal to such courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 75 citizens of Concordia, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCLELLAN:

A resolution adopted by the Bar Association of Arkansas in annual meeting at Little Rock, Ark., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 1639) to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts under such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition signed by 42 citizens of Amherst, Va., and vicinity, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to pro-